arXiv:1005.4400v2 [math.CA] 13 Apr 2011

Multi-parameter singular Radon transforms I: the L^2 theory

Brian Street*

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to study the L^2 boundedness of operators of the form

$$f \mapsto \psi(x) \int f(\gamma_t(x)) K(t)\, dt,$$

where $\gamma_t(x)$ is a C^∞ function defined on a neighborhood of the origin in $(t,x) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^n$, satisfying $\gamma_0(x) \equiv x$, ψ is a C^∞ cutoff function supported on a small neighborhood of $0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and K is a "multi-parameter singular kernel" supported on a small neighborhood of $0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$. The goal is, given an appropriate class of kernels K, to give conditions on γ such that every operator of the above form is bounded on L^2. The case when K is a Calderón-Zygmund kernel was studied by Christ, Nagel, Stein, and Wainger; we generalize their conditions to the case when K has a "multi-parameter" structure. For example, when K is given by a "product kernel." Even when K is a Calderón-Zygmund kernel, our methods yield some new results. This is the first paper in a three part series, the later two of which are joint with E. M. Stein. The second paper deals with the related question of L^p boundedness, while the third paper deals with the special case when γ is real analytic.

Contents

1 Introduction **2**
1.1 Informal statement of the main result . . . 3

2 Overview of the series **4**

3 A Special Case **6**

4 Kernels **10**
4.1 The class $\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}$ . . . 10
4.2 The class $\mathcal{K}$ . . . 11

5 Multi-parameter Carnot-Carathéodory geometry **12**

6 Surfaces **14**

7 Statement of results **15**

8 Basic Notation **16**

9 The work of Christ, Nagel, Stein, and Wainger **17**

10 Informal outline of the proof **21**
10.1 Diffeomorphism invariance . . . 23

11 Multi-parameter Carnot-Carathéodory geometry revisited **24**
11.1 Control of vector fields . . . 26
11.2 More on (X,d) . . . 28

---

*The author was partially supported by NSF DMS-0802587.

12 Surfaces revisited **29**
12.1 Multi-parameter curvature conditions 37
12.2 Proof of Proposition 11.12 38
12.3 T^* is of the same form as T 38

13 The space L^1_δ **39**

14 A general L^2 theorem **40**

15 Completion of the proof **45**

16 Kernels revisited **47**

17 Examples **51**
17.1 Exponentials of vector fields 51
17.2 Nilpotent Lie groups 51
17.3 The L^2 result of Christ, Nagel, Stein, and Wainger 52
17.4 How the assumptions can fail 53
17.5 A translation invariant example 55
17.6 Flag kernels versus product kernels 58
17.7 A multi-parameter difficulty 58
17.8 An example on the Heisenberg group 59

1 Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to prove the L^2 boundedness of multi-parameter singular Radon transforms. These operators generalize the well-studied (single-parameter) singular Radon transforms. The study of the L^p boundedness of these single-parameter singular Radon transforms cumulated in the work of Christ, Nagel, Stein, and Wainger [CNSW99]. They studied operators of the form,

$$Tf(x) = \psi(x) \int f(\gamma_t(x)) K(t)\ dt, \tag{1.1}$$

where ψ is a C_0^∞ cut-off function, supported near $0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\gamma_t(x) = \gamma(t,x)$ is a C^∞ map defined in a neighborhood of the origin in $\mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying $\gamma_0(x) \equiv x$, and K is a standard Calderón-Zygmund kernel on $\mathbb{R}^N$ supported for t near 0. This means that K satisfies

$$\left|\partial_t^\alpha K(t)\right| \lesssim |t|^{-N-|\alpha|}, \quad t \neq 0,$$

along with a certain "cancellation condition" which we will make precise later (see Definition 16.4).[1] In [CNSW99], appropriate "curvature conditions" on γ were assumed to guarantee T extends to a bounded map $L^p \to L^p$ $(1 < p < \infty)$. See Section 9 for a further discussion of these curvature conditions. The goal of this paper is to replace K in (1.1) with an appropriate multi-parameter kernel and develop conditions on γ which will allow us to show T is bounded on L^2.

For instance, one might consider the case when K is a so-called "product kernel" supported near 0. To define this notion, suppose we have decomposed $\mathbb{R}^N = \mathbb{R}^{N_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}^{N_\nu}$, and write $t = (t_1, \ldots, t_\nu) \in \mathbb{R}^{N_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}^{N_\nu}$. A product kernel satisfies

$$\left|\partial_{t_1}^{\alpha_1} \cdots \partial_{t_\nu}^{\alpha_\nu} K(t)\right| \lesssim |t_1|^{-N_1-|\alpha_1|} \cdots |t_\nu|^{-N_\nu-|\alpha_\nu|},$$

again along with certain "cancellation conditions" (see Definition 16.4).[2] We will develop conditions on γ so that the operator T given by (1.1) extends to a bounded operator on L^2 for every such product kernel (relative to a fixed decomposition of $\mathbb{R}^N$). In addition, we will study kernels more general than these product kernels. When restricted to the single-parameter case, our results will imply the L^2 results of [CNSW99]–and, in fact, generalize the L^2 results of [CNSW99], even in the single-parameter case (see Section 3 for a discussion of this).

---

[1] Actually, [CNSW99] restricts attention to homogeneous kernels K (and replaces the integral in (1.1) with $\int_{|t|<a}$, where $a > 0$ is some small number). This restriction to homogeneous kernels is not essential to their work.

[2] The simplest example of a product kernel is $K(t_1, \ldots, t_\nu) = K_1(t_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes K_\nu(t_\nu)$, where $K_1, \ldots, K_\nu$ are Calderón-Zygmund kernels.

This paper is the first in a three part series, the second two of which are joint with Elias Stein. The second paper, [SS11a] will investigate the corresponding L^p theory ($1 < p < \infty$). The third paper, [SS11b], will discuss, in detail, the special case when γ is a real analytic function–a situation where more can be said. We give an overview of the results of [SS11b] in Section 2, to give the reader a view of this entire project.

The outline of this paper is as follows. In Section 2 we discuss the sequel to this work [SS11b]. In Section 3 we discuss some special cases which motivate our main definitions and theorem. Sections 4-6 give all the definitions and notation necessary to state our main theorem. Section 7 includes the statement of the main theorem. Section 9 gives an overview of some of the main aspects of [CNSW99] we will use, along with some minor extensions that will be necessary for our proofs. Section 10 gives a high-level overview of the proof. Sections 11-13 are devoted to stating the technical results and definitions necessary for our proof. In Section 14 a general L^2 theorem is stated and proved, which will imply our main theorem. In Section 15 the general theorem from Section 14 is used to prove the main theorem of the paper. In Section 16 we offer a deeper study of the class of kernels we use. Finally, in Section 17, a number of examples are given where the main theorem applies.

Acknowledgements I would like to thank Eli Stein. This project was born from a discussion in his office, where upon hearing the results of [Str11], he suggested that perhaps they could be used to answer questions like the ones investigated in this paper. In addition, he explained to me some of the surrounding theory. Once the main results for this paper were completed, he and I combined efforts to complete the project in [SS11a, SS11b]. I would also like to thank Alex Nagel who informed me of the paper [CWW06], and Steve Wainger who described it (and related results) to me in detail. These discussions helped shape my thoughts on pure powers and non-pure powers as described in this paper. Finally, I found it helpful to know some of the recent theory developed by Nagel, Ricci, Stein, and Wainger [NRSW11] regarding convolution operators given by flag kernels on nilpotent groups. I thank all four of them for describing various aspects of it to me.

1.1 Informal statement of the main result

In this section, we informally state the special case of our main theorem when $K(t_1, \ldots, t_\nu)$ is a product kernel relative to the decomposition $\mathbb{R}^N = \mathbb{R}^{N_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}^{N_\nu}$ (see the introduction and Definition 16.4 for this notion). We suppose we are given a C^∞ function, $\gamma(t,x) = \gamma_t(x) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ defined on a small neighborhood of the origin in $(t,x) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^n$, satisfying $\gamma_0(x) \equiv x$. For t sufficiently small, γ_t is a diffeomorhpism onto its image. Thus, it makes sense to write γ_t^{-1}, the inverse mapping. We define the vector field

$$W(t,x) = \left.\frac{d}{d\epsilon}\right|_{\epsilon=1} \gamma_{\epsilon t} \circ \gamma_t^{-1}(x) \in T_x\mathbb{R}^n.$$

For a collection of vector fields $\mathcal{V}$, let $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{V})$ denote the involutive distribution generated by $\mathcal{V}$. I.e., the smallest C^∞ module containing $\mathcal{V}$ and such that if $X, Y \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{V})$ then $[X,Y] \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{V})$. For a multi-index $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^N$, write $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_\nu)$, with $\alpha_\mu \in \mathbb{N}^{N_\mu}$.

Decompose W into a Taylor series in the t variable,

$$W(t,x) \sim \sum_\alpha t^\alpha X_\alpha.$$

We call $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_\nu) \in \mathbb{N}^N = \mathbb{N}^{N_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{N}^{N_\nu}$ a pure power if $\alpha_\mu \neq 0$ for precisely one μ. Otherwise, we call it a non-pure power.

We assume that the following conditions hold "uniformly" for $\delta = (\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_\nu) \in (0,1]^\nu$, though we defer making this notion of uniform precise to Section 6.

- For every $\delta \in (0,1]^\nu$,

$$\mathcal{D}_\delta := \mathcal{D}\left(\left\{\delta_1^{|\alpha_1|} \cdots \delta_\nu^{|\alpha_\nu|} X_{\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_\nu} : (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_\nu) \text{ is a pure power}\right\}\right)$$

is finitely generated as a C^∞ module, uniformly in δ.

- For every $\delta \in (0,1]^\nu$,
$$W(\delta_1 t_1, \ldots, \delta_\nu t_\nu) \in \mathcal{D}_\delta,$$
uniformly in δ.

Remark 1.1. If it were not for the "uniform" aspect of the above assumptions, they would be independent of δ. Thus it is the uniform part, which we have not made precise, that is the heart of the above assumptions.

Our main theorem is,

Theorem 1.2. *Under the above assumptions (which are made precise in Section 6), the operator given by*
$$f \mapsto \psi(x) \int f(\gamma_t(x)) K(t)\, dt,$$
is bounded on L^2, for every product kernel $K(t_1, \ldots, t_\nu)$, with sufficiently small support, provided ψ has sufficiently small support.

The precise statement of our main result (where more general kernels are considered) can be found in Theorems 7.1 and 7.2.

2 Overview of the series

One way to view this paper is as the foundation for the theory developed in the sequels where (in joint works with E. M. Stein) the corresponding L^p theory is developed [SS11a], and the special case when γ is real analytic is investigated [SS11b]. In this section, we discuss the main results of [SS11b], where γ is assumed to be real analytic. For the purposes of this overview, we restrict our attention to the case when K is a "product kernel," though more general cases will be covered in the later sections and in [SS11a, SS11b]. All of the results discussed here will be contained in [SS11b].

The setting is as follows. We decompose $\mathbb{R}^N$ into ν factors, $\mathbb{R}^N = \mathbb{R}^{N_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}^{N_\nu}$, and we write $t = (t_1, \ldots, t_\nu) \in \mathbb{R}^N$. We consider product kernels, $K(t_1, \ldots, t_\nu)$, relative to this decomposition (see the introduction and Definition 16.4 for the notion of a product kernel). In particular, when $\nu = 1$, K is standard Calderón-Zygmund kernel. We suppose that we are given a germ of a real analytic function defined on a neighborhood of the origin in $\mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^n$:[3]
$$\gamma(t,x) = \gamma_t(x) : \mathbb{R}^N_0 \times \mathbb{R}^n_0 \to \mathbb{R}^n,$$
satisfying $\gamma_0(x) \equiv x$.

There are two, closely related, operators which are of interest to us:

- $Tf(x) = \psi(x) \int f(\gamma_{t_1,\ldots,t_\nu}(x)) K(t_1, \ldots, t_\nu)\, dt_1 \cdots dt_\nu$, where K product kernel supported near $t = 0$ and ψ is a C^∞ cut-off function supported near $x = 0$.
- $\mathcal{M}f(x) = \psi(x) \sup_{0<\delta_1,\ldots,\delta_\nu<<1} \int_{|t|\leq 1} |f(\gamma_{\delta_1 t_1,\ldots,\delta_\nu t_\nu}(x))|\, dt_1 \cdots dt_\nu$, where ψ is a C^∞ cut-off function supported near $x = 0$, and the supremum is taken over $\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_\nu$ small.

Note that the above operators only make sense if K and ψ are supported sufficiently close to 0, since γ is only defined on a neighborhood of 0. Our goal is two-fold:

(I) Give conditions on γ such that T is bounded L^p $(1 < p < \infty)$ for *every* such product kernel.

(II) Give conditions on γ such that $\mathcal{M}$ is bounded on L^p $(1 < p \leq \infty)$.

---

[3] Here, we have used the notation $f : \mathbb{R}^n_0 \to \mathbb{R}^m$ to denote that f is a germ of a function defined on a neighborhood of $0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

This paper is only concerned with Goal I in the case $p = 2$, though Goal II is an essential part of [SS11a, SS11b].

In this paper and [SS11a], we consider the more general case when γ is C^∞. When γ is C^∞, we put two types[4] of assumptions on γ to ensure that T and $\mathcal{M}$ are bounded on L^p:

- A "finite type" condition. This condition can be seen as a generalization of the condition in [CNSW99], where the case $\nu = 1$ (i.e., when K is a Calderón-Zygmund kernel) is treated.
- An "algebraic" condition. This condition holds automatically in the case $\nu = 1$ (i.e., when K is a Calderón-Zygmund kernel).

For a discussion of these two conditions in an easy to understand special case, we refer the reader to Section 3. When we restrict attention to the case that γ is real analytic in [SS11b], we will use a Weierstrass-type preparation theorem (from [Gal79]) to help show:

- The "finite-type" condition holds automatically when γ is real analytic.
- The "algebraic" condition is not necessary for the L^p boundedness of $\mathcal{M}$ when γ is real analytic (though it is necessary, in some cases, for the L^p boundedness of T).

Because of this, our results take a much simpler form when γ is assumed to be real analytic. We state them here.

Theorem 2.1 ([SS11b]). *When γ is real analytic, $\mathcal{M}$ is bounded on L^p $(1 < p \leq \infty)$ under no additional assumptions.*

Remark 2.2. There are at least two special cases of Theorem 2.1 in the literature. The first is due to Bourgain [Bou89] in the case $\nu = 1$. He studied the case $\gamma(t,x) : \mathbb{R}^1_0 \times \mathbb{R}^2_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ given by $\gamma(t,x) = x - tv(x)$, where $v : \mathbb{R}^2_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ is a real analytic vector field. Another special case of Theorem 2.4 is due to Christ [Chr92], where left invariant maximal functions (of a certain form) on a nilpotent Lie group are studied.

We now turn to T. We begin by stating the corollary of our general result in the special case $\nu = 1$,

Corollary 2.3 ([SS11b]). *When $\nu = 1$ (i.e., when K is a Calderón-Zygmund kernel) and when γ is real analytic, $T : L^p \rightarrow L^p$ $(1 < p < \infty)$ under no additional assumptions. This result is a special case of Theorem 2.4 below.*

Unfortunately, when we move to the case $\nu > 1$, it is necessary to put additional hypotheses on γ to ensure that T is bounded on L^p (or even L^2), *even when γ is real analytic.* Examples demonstrating this can be found in Section 17.5.

To explain our assumptions on γ, we must first introduce some notation. In [CNSW99] it was shown that every γ could be written in the form,

$$\gamma_{t_1,\ldots,t_\nu}(x) \sim \exp\left(\sum_{|\alpha_1|+\cdots+|\alpha_\nu|>0} t_1^{\alpha_1}\cdots t_\nu^{\alpha_\nu} X_{\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_\nu}\right) x,$$

where the $X_{\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_\nu}$ are vector fields and we write $\gamma_t(x) \sim \exp\left(\sum_\alpha t^\alpha X_\alpha\right) x$ if $\gamma_t(x) = \exp\left(\sum_{|\alpha|<L} t^\alpha X_\alpha\right) x + O\left(|t|^L\right)$.

To each $X_{\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_\nu}$ we assign the formal degree $d_{\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_\nu} = (|\alpha_1|, \ldots, |\alpha_\nu|)$. We say that d_α is a *pure power* if d_α is nonzero in precisely one component, otherwise we say it is a *non-pure power.* Define two sets

$$\mathcal{P} = \{(X_\alpha, d_\alpha) : d_\alpha \text{ is a pure power}\},$$

$$\mathcal{N} = \{(X_\alpha, d_\alpha) : d_\alpha \text{ is a non-pure power}\},$$

Let $\mathcal{S}$ be the smallest set of vector fields with formal degrees such that,

---

[4] We do not make the dichotomy between these two types of conditions explicit in this paper: it is only particularly relevant when γ is real analytic, and we defer a precise discussion of these issues to [SS11b].

- $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$,
- If $(X_1, d_1), (X_2, d_2) \in \mathcal{S}$, then $([X_1, X_2], d_1 + d_2) \in \mathcal{S}$.

Theorem 2.4 ([SS11b])**.** *Let γ be real analytic. Suppose that, for every $(Y, e) \in \mathcal{N}$, there is a neighborhood $U = U(Y, e)$ of 0 and vector fields $(X_1, d_1), \ldots, (X_q, d_q) \in \mathcal{S}$ such that for every $\delta \in [0,1]^\nu$, we have*[5]

$$\delta^e Y\big|_U = \sum_{j=1}^{q} c_j^\delta \delta^{d_j} X_j\big|_U,$$

where $\left\{c_j^\delta : \delta \in [0,1]^\nu\right\} \subset C^\infty(U)$ is a bounded set. Then T is bounded on L^p $(1 < p < \infty)$ for every product kernel K (with sufficiently small support), provided ψ has sufficiently small support.

Remark 2.5. Actually, the result in [SS11b] requires less than is outlined in Theorem 2.4: the set U can depend on δ in a specific way, and one requires less than $\left\{c_j^\delta\right\}$ forming a bounded set. However, while this stronger result is important for applications, it requires a good deal of notation to state precisely. We, therefore, defer the discussion to [SS11b].

Remark 2.6. Note that if $Y = 0$ for every $(Y, e) \in \mathcal{N}$, then T is bounded on L^p, as the conditions of Theorem 2.4 hold trivially. In particular, in the case $\nu = 1$, $\mathcal{N} = \emptyset$ and Corollary 2.3 follows.

Remark 2.7. One of the main aspects of [SS11b] is showing that Theorem 2.4 (and its more general analog alluded to in Remark 2.5) are a special case of Theorem 7.1, below (at least when $p = 2$; more general p are studied in [SS11a]).

3 A Special Case

Before we enter into the rather lengthy statement of our main result, we discuss a special case. Namely, the case when,

$$\gamma_t(x) = e^{\sum_{0<|\alpha|\leq M} t^\alpha X_\alpha} x, \tag{3.1}$$

where each X_α is a C^∞ vector field–note that this is an exponential of a *finite* sum of vector fields. Later in the paper, we will deal with more general γ; see Remark 3.6 for some comments on how we will do this. The goal in this section is to discuss conditions we may place on the X_α so that the operator given by (1.1) is bounded on L^2. The conditions will depend on the type of kernel K which is used in (1.1).

We begin by discussing the work in [CNSW99] in this special case. Then, we discuss a way in which our results generalize the results in [CNSW99] in the single-parameter setting. We then close by informally discussing a special case of the multi-parameter setting.

In [CNSW99], operators of the form,

$$f \mapsto \psi(x) \int f(\gamma_t(x)) K(t)\ dt, \tag{3.2}$$

were studied,[6] where ψ is an appropriate cut-off functions, and K is a Calderón-Zygmund kernel with small support (how small depends on γ). One of the main aspects of [CNSW99] was exhibiting conditions on γ for which the operator given by (3.2) is bounded on L^p $(1 < p < \infty)$. In the special case when γ is given by (3.1), this condition is that $\{X_\alpha\}$ satisfy Hörmander's condition. I.e., that the Lie algebra generated by the vector fields $\{X_\alpha\}$ span the tangent space at every point of the support of ψ.

Now suppose we are no longer in the situation where $\{X_\alpha\}$ satisfy Hörmander's condition. Instead, let $\mathcal{D}$ be the involutive distribution generated by the X_α. I.e., let $\mathcal{D}$ be the C^∞ module generated by the X_α and the commutators of the X_α of all orders. Suppose that $\mathcal{D}$ is finitely generated[7] as a C^∞

---

[5] We write $\delta^{d_j} = \prod_{\mu=1}^{\nu} \delta_\mu^{d_j^\mu}$.

[6] [CNSW99] did not restrict attention to γ of the form (3.1); nor will we. However, it is easier to understand the basic ideas in this special case. For the connection between [CNSW99] and ours when γ is more general, see Section 17.3 where a there is a proof of how the framework of [CNSW99] fits into our more general setting.

[7] Usually, one sees the condition that $\mathcal{D}$ is *locally* finitely generated. However, our results are local in nature, and so it suffices to assume that $\mathcal{D}$ is finitely generated.

module.[8] Note, if $\mathcal{D}_x$ is the vector space given by evaluating all of the vector fields in $\mathcal{D}$ at the point x, then we are not assuming $\dim \mathcal{D}_x$ is constant in x. The classical Frobenius theorem applies to show that $\mathbb{R}^n$ is locally foliated into leaves, where the space of smooth sections of the tangent bundle of each leaf is given by $\mathcal{D}$. Since the dimension of $\dim \mathcal{D}_x$ is not necessarily constant, this could be a singular foliation; i.e., the dimension of the leaf may vary from point to point. It is clear that, when restricted to each leaf, $\{X_\alpha\}$ satisfy Hörmander's condition.

One might hope, given the above discussion, that one could apply the theory of [CNSW99] to each leaf, and then put this all together to obtain the L^p (or, in our case, L^2) boundedness of (3.2). Unfortunately, one runs into a technical difficulty: near a singular[9] point of the involutive distribution $\mathcal{D}$, the classical proofs of the Frobenius theorem do not yield uniform enough control of the coordinate charts defining the leaves to be able to apply the theory of [CNSW99] uniformly on each leaf.

Fortunately, one *can* obtain uniform control of these coordinate charts. Indeed, this was one of the main aspects of [Str11]. In fact, the theory in [Str11] will be the main technical tool on which we will base all of our "scaling" arguments (see Sections 5 and 11 for more on [Str11]).[10] Because of this, in the above case, we will obtain the L^2 boundedness of (3.2) in this paper.[11]

Remark 3.1. In the special case when the X_α are real analytic, the distribution $\mathcal{D}$ is automatically finitely generated as a C^∞ module (when restricted to a sufficiently small neighborhood).[12] This gives intuition as to why Corollary 2.3 is true.

Let us rephrase the above single-parameter theory in a slightly more complicated way, which will lead us naturally to the multi-parameter theory. In what follows, we take the standard dilations on $t = (t_1, \ldots, t_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N$:

$$\delta t = (\delta t_1, \ldots, \delta t_N), \quad \delta \in (0, 1].$$

In later sections of the paper, we will raise δ to different powers in each coordinate, but we ignore such generalizations for the moment. One of the main aspects of Calderón-Zygmund kernels is that the class of kernels is dilation invariant:

$$\delta^{-N} K\left(\delta^{-1} t\right)$$

is again a Calderón-Zygmund kernel if K is (and this is true uniformly in δ). To take advantage of this dilation invariance, we wish to restate the above condition that the involutive distribution, $\mathcal{D}$, generated by $\{X_\alpha\}$ is finitely generated as a C^∞ module, in a naturally dilation invariant way.

Note that,

$$\gamma_{\delta t}(x) = e^{\sum_{0<|\alpha|\leq M} t^\alpha \delta^{|\alpha|} X_\alpha} x.$$

Our dilation invariant version of the above assumption is that the involutive distribution generated by $\left\{\delta^{|\alpha|} X_\alpha\right\}$ is finitely generated "uniformly" for $\delta \in (0, 1]$ (of course for every δ the involutive distribution so generated is always equal to $\mathcal{D}$, so it is the uniform aspect that is the point). We make this notion of uniform precise in a moment. We will see, in the single-parameter case (which we are presently considering), this uniformity follows for free (Lemma 3.2), but this is not the case in the multi-parameter setting (see Section 17.7).

Assign to each vector field X_α the formal degree $|\alpha|$. Recursively, assign formal degrees as follows: if X_1 has formal degree d_1 and X_2 has formal degree d_2, then we assign $[X_1, X_2]$ the formal degree $d_1 + d_2$ (it is possible that the same vector field may have more than one formal degree). Scaling X_α by $\delta^{|\alpha|}$ induces a scaling $\delta^{d_1} X_1$ where X_1 has formal degree d_1.

Our "uniform" assumption in δ is as follows. We assume that there is a finite list of the above vector fields $X_1, \ldots, X_q$, X_j having formal degree d_j, each $(X_\alpha, |\alpha|)$ appearing as some (X_j, d_j), and this list satisfying,

---

[8] This is a generalization of Hörmander's condition. Indeed, Hörmander's condition states that the involutive distribution generated by the X_α is the entire space of vector fields (on a neighborhood of the support of ψ). This distribution is clearly finitely generated: it is generated by the coordinate vector fields.

[9] A point x is said to be singular, if $\dim \mathcal{D}_x$ is not constant on any neighborhood of x.

[10] In particular, the results in [Str11] allow us to use multi-parameter Carnot-Carthéodory balls, without resorting to the weakly-comparable hypotheses in Section 4 of [TW03], by introducing some extra assumptions on the relevant vector fields. This is an essential point of our analysis, and might also be useful in problems related to the ones in [TW03].

[11] The corresponding L^p $(1 < p < \infty)$ boundedness holds as well, and will be covered in the sequel to this paper [SS11a].

[12] This is a result of Lobry [Lob70], and can be seen as a consequence of the Weierstrass preparation theorem. See [Lob70, SS11b] for a further discussion.

$$\left[\delta^{d_j} X_j, \delta^{d_k} X_k\right] = \sum_{l=1}^{q} c_{j,k}^{l,\delta} \delta^{d_l} X_l, \quad \delta \in (0,1], \tag{3.3}$$

where $c_{j,k}^{l,\delta}$ is a C^∞ function[13] uniformly in δ. Note that, by taking $\delta = 1$, (3.3) implies that $\mathcal{D}$ is a finitely generated distribution (it is generated by $X_1, \ldots, X_q$ as a C^∞ module). We also have the converse,

Lemma 3.2. *One may choose* $(X_1, d_1), \ldots, (X_q, d_q)$ *as above, so that* (3.3) *holds, if and only if* $\mathcal{D}$ *is finitely generated as a* C^∞ *module.*

Proof. As noted above, the only if part is clear. To prove the converse, we will prove a stronger form of (3.3). Indeed, we will show that we may select $(X_1, d_1), \ldots, (X_q, d_q)$ as above so that,

$$[X_j, X_k] = \sum_{d_l \leq d_j + d_k} c_{j,k}^{l} X_l, \tag{3.4}$$

where $c_{j,k}^{l}$ are C^∞ functions. Note that (3.4) implies (3.3), as one may take $c_{j,k}^{l,\delta} = \delta^{d_j + d_k - d_l} c_{j,k}^{l}$, when $d_j + d_k \geq d_l$, and 0 otherwise. Incidentally, (3.4) was first introduced in [NSW85] to study vector fields which satisfy Hörmander's condition. Suppose $X_1, \ldots, X_r$ are generators for $\mathcal{D}$ as a C^∞ module. We may assume that each X_j arises as an iterated commutator of the X_α. Thus, each X_j, $j = 1, \ldots, r$, has assigned to it a formal degree d_j. We may also assume that each X_α appears in the list $X_1, \ldots, X_r$. We let $(X_1, d_1), \ldots, (X_q, d_q)$ be an enumeration of all vector fields with formal degree d_k such that $d_k \leq \max_{1 \leq l \leq r} d_l$ (here we have taken $X_1, \ldots, X_r$ to be the first r elements of $X_1, \ldots, X_q$). We claim that this list: $(X_1, d_1), \ldots, (X_q, d_q)$ satisfies (3.4). Indeed, if we take the commutator $[X_j, X_k]$ ($1 \leq j, k \leq q$), there are two possibilities. The first possibility is that $d_j + d_k \leq \max_{1 \leq l \leq r} d_l$. In this case $([X_j, X_k], d_j + d_k)$ already appears in the list $(X_1, d_1), \ldots, (X_q, d_q)$ and so (3.4) is trivial. On the other hand, if $d_j + d_k > \max_{1 \leq l \leq r} d_l$, then we use the fact that,

$$[X_j, X_k] = \sum_{l=1}^{r} c_{j,k}^{l} X_l,$$

as this immediately follows from the fact that $X_1, \ldots, X_r$ generate $\mathcal{D}$ as a C^∞ module. Now (3.4) follows immediately. $\square$

Now that we have stated our single-parameter assumptions in a dilation invariant manner, we are prepared to state a multi-parameter result. For the purposes of this introduction, we restrict our attention to the two-parameter situation, but we will see later in the paper that all of these ideas extend to any number of parameters.

We will be considering operators of the form

$$f \mapsto \psi(x) \int f\left(\gamma_{(s,t)}(x)\right) K(s,t)\, ds\, dt, \tag{3.5}$$

where $(s,t) \in \mathbb{R}^{N_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{N_2}$. Here $K(s,t)$ is a product kernel[14] (supported near $s = t = 0$). That is, K satisfies,

$$\left|\partial_s^\alpha \partial_t^\beta K(s,t)\right| \lesssim |s|^{-N_1 - |\alpha|} |t|^{-N_2 - |\beta|},$$

along with certain cancellation conditions. See Section 16 for more precise details. The relevant dilations in this situation are two-parameter. For $(\delta_1, \delta_2) \in [0,1]^2$, we define,

$$(\delta_1, \delta_2)(s,t) = (\delta_1 s, \delta_2 t).$$

---

[13] When we present our assumptions on the vector fields in more detail (see Section 5) we will only require (3.3) to hold locally near each point in a precise sense, and will require less than the functions being C^∞. We defer such details to Section 6.

[14] For our main theorem, we will discuss kernels more general than product kernels. See Sections 4 and 16.

We consider γ of the form,

$$\gamma_{(s,t)}(x) = e^{\sum_{0<|\alpha|+|\beta|\leq M} s^\alpha t^\beta X_{\alpha,\beta}} x,$$

where, as before, the $X_{\alpha,\beta}$ are C^∞ vector fields. Dilating gives,

$$\gamma_{(\delta_1 s,\delta_2 t)}(x) = e^{\sum_{0<|\alpha|+|\beta|\leq M} \delta_1^{|\alpha|}\delta_2^{|\beta|} s^\alpha t^\beta X_{\alpha,\beta}} x.$$

In analogy with the single parameter case, we assign to the vector field $X_{\alpha,\beta}$ the two-parameter formal degree $d_{\alpha,\beta} = (|\alpha|, |\beta|)$. Thus, scaling $X_{\alpha,\beta}$ by $\delta_1^{|\alpha|}\delta_2^{|\beta|}$ is the same as scaling it by $(\delta_1,\delta_2)^{d_{\alpha,\beta}}$, where we think of $d_{\alpha,\beta}$ as a multi-index.

In the two-parameter situation, a new phenomenon appears. We must separate our vector fields into two sets and view these two sets differently. To define this, we call $d_{\alpha,\beta}$ a *pure power* if either $|\alpha|$ or $|\beta|$ is 0. Otherwise we call it a non-pure power. We define two sets,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{P} &= \{(X_{\alpha,\beta}, d_{\alpha,\beta}) : d_{\alpha,\beta} \text{ is a pure power}\},\\ \mathcal{N} &= \{(X_{\alpha,\beta}, d_{\alpha,\beta}) : d_{\alpha,\beta} \text{ is a non-pure power}\}.\end{aligned}$$

In the single-parameter case, every power was a pure power, but in the multi-parameter case, we must deal with the set $\mathcal{N}$ in a different manner.

First we discuss the case when $X_{\alpha,\beta} = 0$ for every $(X_{\alpha,\beta}, d_{\alpha,\beta}) \in \mathcal{N}$. This case works in much the same way as the single-parameter case. We recursively define formal degrees on the iterated commutators of the elements of $\mathcal{P}$ as follows. If X_1 has formal degree $d_1 \in \mathbb{N}^2$ and X_2 has formal degree $d_2 \in \mathbb{N}^2$, we assign to $[X_1, X_2]$ the formal degree $d_1 + d_2$. Our assumption is that there is a finite list $(X_1, d_1), \ldots, (X_q, d_q)$ of these vector fields, containing the set $\mathcal{P}$, such that for every $\delta \in [0,1]^2$, we can write,

$$\left[\delta^{d_j} X_j, \delta^{d_k} X_k\right] = \sum_{l=1}^{q} c_{j,k}^{l,\delta} \delta^{d_l} X_l, \tag{3.6}$$

where $c_{j,k}^{l,\delta} \in C^\infty$ uniformly[15] in δ. Note, by taking $\delta_2 = 0$, (3.6) implies that the vector fields $\{X_{\alpha,0}\}$ satisfy the single-parameter assumptions. Similarly, by taking $\delta_1 = 0$, (3.6) implies that the vector fields $\{X_{0,\beta}\}$ also satisfy the single parameter assumptions. Moreover, (3.6) implies more: it implies a condition on the commutators between the $\{X_{\alpha,0}\}$ and the $\{X_{0,\beta}\}$.

More generally, when there is some nonzero vector field in $\mathcal{N}$, we proceed as above, obtaining the list $(X_1, d_1), \ldots, (X_q, d_q)$ from $\mathcal{P}$ and assuming it satisfies (3.6). We further assume that for every $(Y, e) \in \mathcal{N}$ and every $\delta \in [0,1]^2$, we have,

$$\delta^e Y = \sum_{l=1}^{q} c_Y^{l,\delta} \delta^{d_l} X_l, \tag{3.7}$$

with $c_Y^{l,\delta} \in C^\infty$ uniformly in δ. See Section 17.5 for an example of how L^2 boundedness can fail if we do not have (3.7) and Remarks 10.3 and 12.15 for how (3.7) is used in the proof.

Our main theorem is a generalization of the following: under the above hypotheses, the operator given by (3.5) is bounded on L^2.

Remark 3.3. It may not be obvious that our main theorem generalizes the above. The fact that it does is discussed in Section 17.1.

Remark 3.4. As mentioned before, the obvious analog of Lemma 3.2 in the multi-parameter setting does not hold. This is discussed in Section 17.7.

Remark 3.5. Our assumptions above on the set $\mathcal{P}$ (i.e., the existence of $(X_1, d_1), \ldots, (X_q, d_q)$) can be thought of as the "finite type" assumptions discussed in Section 2. The assumptions on the set $\mathcal{N}$ can be thought of as the "algebraic" assumptions. As mentioned in Section 2, the "finite type" assumptions hold automatically when the X_α are real analytic. This is proven in [SS11b].

---

[15] Again, we have just stated a special case of our assumptions on $c_{j,k}^{l,\delta}$ for simplicity.

Remark 3.6. In the rest of the paper, we work with more general functions $\gamma_t(x)$, not necessarily assuming that $\gamma_t(x) = e^{\sum t^\alpha X_\alpha} x$. If one were to assume that $\gamma_t(x) = e^{A(t)}x$ for some C^∞ vector field depending smoothly on t with $A(0) = 0$, then it would not be difficult the generalize the above assumptions. Unfortunately, not every γ is of this form. Fortunately, there is a convenient alternative. Since $\gamma_0(x) \equiv x$, γ_t is a diffeomorphism onto its image, for t sufficiently small. Thus, we may define,

$$W(t,x) = \frac{d}{d\epsilon}\bigg|_{\epsilon=1} \gamma_{\epsilon t} \circ \gamma_t^{-1}(x) \in T_x\mathbb{R}^n.$$

Note that $W(t)$ is a vector field, depending smoothly on t, satisfying $W(0) = 0$. Moreover, it turns out that the map $\gamma \mapsto W$ is a *bijection* (see Proposition 12.1). The inverse mapping is given by solving an ODE. This ODE is similar to the one which is used to define the exponential map. We will see that everywhere we wish to use the exponential map, it can be replaced by the inverse mapping $W \mapsto \gamma$. Thus, in what follows, we will exhibit analogs of the above conditions applied to the vector field $W(t)$.

4 Kernels

In this section, we define the kernels K for which we will study operators of the form (1.1). The kernels we study will be distributions on $\mathbb{R}^N$, and they will be supported in $B^N(a) = \left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : |x| < a\right\}$, where $a > 0$ is a small number to be chosen later.[16] Fix $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$. We will be studying ν-parameter operators. Fix a subset $\mathcal{A} \subseteq [0,1]^\nu$ such that if $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in \mathcal{A}$, then $\delta_1 \vee \delta_2 \in \mathcal{A}$.

We suppose that we are given ν-parameter dilations on $\mathbb{R}^N$. That is, we are given $e = (e_1, \ldots, e_N)$ with each $0 \neq e_j = \left(e_j^1, \ldots, e_j^\nu\right) \in [0,\infty)^\nu$. For $\delta \in [0,\infty)^\nu$ and $t = (t_1, \ldots, t_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N$, we define

$$\delta t = \left(\delta^{e_1} t_1, \ldots, \delta^{e_N} t_N\right), \tag{4.1}$$

thereby obtaining ν parameter dilations on $\mathbb{R}^N$.

The class of distributions we will define will depend on N, a, $\mathcal{A}$, and e. At a first reading, the reader may wish to take $\mathcal{A} = [0,1]^\nu$, as this case contains all the main ideas.

We will make two passes at the definition of the class of kernels. First, we will define a class of kernels which we will denote by $\widetilde{\mathcal{K}} = \widetilde{\mathcal{K}}(N, e, a, \mathcal{A})$. This class will be simple to understand, and contains all of the main ideas. Our proof, however, will works for a slightly larger class of kernels $\mathcal{K}(N, e, a, \mathcal{A})$. This class of kernels is important for applications, and so we state our results in this context. On a first pass, the reader may wish to just understand the proof in the case of $\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}$, however.

Remark 4.1. Actually, the class $\mathcal{K}$ is much simpler to understand in the case when $\mathcal{A} = [0,1]^\nu$. See Lemma 16.2 for details.

4.1 The class $\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}$

For reach μ, $1 \leq \mu \leq \nu$, and given $t = (t_1, \ldots, t_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N$, let t^μ denote those coordinates t_j of t such that $e_j^\mu \neq 0$.

Given a function ς on $\mathbb{R}^N$, and $j \in \mathbb{N}^\nu$, define

$$\varsigma^{\left(2^j\right)}(t) = 2^{j\cdot e_1 + \cdots + j\cdot e_N} \varsigma\left(2^j t\right).$$

Note that $\varsigma^{\left(2^j\right)}$ is defined in such a way that

$$\int \varsigma^{\left(2^j\right)}(t)\; dt = \int \varsigma(t)\; dt.$$

Let $-\log_2 \mathcal{A} = \left\{j \in \mathbb{N}^\nu : 2^{-j} \in \mathcal{A}\right\}$. Note that if $\mathcal{A} = [0,1]^\nu$, then $-\log_2 \mathcal{A} = \mathbb{N}^\nu$.

---

[16] For one thing, we will always choose $a > 0$ so small that for $|t| \leq a$, γ_t is a diffeomorphism onto its image; so that γ_t^{-1} makes sense.

Definition 4.2. We define $\widetilde{\mathcal{K}} = \widetilde{\mathcal{K}}(N, e, a, \mathcal{A})$ to be the set of all distributions, K, of the form

$$K = \sum_{j \in -\log_2 \mathcal{A}} \varsigma_j^{(2^j)} \tag{4.2}$$

where $\{\varsigma_j\} \subset C_0^\infty\left(B^N(a)\right)$ is a bounded set, satisfying

$$\int \varsigma_j(t)\, dt^\mu = 0. \tag{4.3}$$

The convergence in (4.2) is taken in the sense of distributions. We will see in Lemma 16.1 that every such sum converges in distribution.

Remark 4.3. Given N, e, and $\mathcal{A}$, we will define a class of functions γ_t such that the operator given by (1.1) is bounded on L^2 for every $K \in \widetilde{\mathcal{K}}(N, e, a, \mathcal{A})$ for $a > 0$ sufficiently small. Note that if $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$, then $\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}(N, e, a, \mathcal{A}) \subseteq \widetilde{\mathcal{K}}(N, e, a, \mathcal{B})$. However, our theorem will apply to a larger class of γ corresponding to $\mathcal{A}$ than it will corresponding to $\mathcal{B}$.

4.2 The class $\mathcal{K}$

While the class $\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}$ contains all of the main ideas, in many applications the kernels that arise are in a slightly larger class, which we denote $\mathcal{K}(N, e, a, \mathcal{A})$. Indeed, we will see the benefits of working with this class in Section 16. The main point, here, is that in our proofs we do not use the full cancellation condition (4.3). Thus, the definition of the class $\mathcal{K}$ will be the same as that of $\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}$, but we will weaken the condition (4.3).

Before we can define $\mathcal{K}$, we need some new notation. Fix a constant $C \geq 1$, and $j = (j_1, \ldots, j_\nu) \in -\log_2 \mathcal{A}$. For $1 \leq \mu \leq \nu$, we say μ is $j, \mathcal{A}$-minimal, if there does not exist a $k \in -\log_2 \mathcal{A}$ such that $j_\mu > k_\mu$. For $1 \leq \mu_1, \mu_2 \leq \nu$, we write

$$\mu_1 \preceq_{j,C,\mathcal{A}} \mu_2$$

if for every $k = (k_1, \ldots, k_\nu) \in -\log_2 \mathcal{A}$ with $j_{\mu_1} > k_{\mu_1}$, we have $j_{\mu_1} - k_{\mu_1} \leq C\left(j_{\mu_2} - k_{\mu_2}\right)$. We define

$$[\mu_1]_{j,C,\mathcal{A}} = \left\{\mu_2 : \mu_1 \preceq_{j,C,\mathcal{A}} \mu_2 \text{ and } \mu_2 \preceq_{j,C,\mathcal{A}} \mu_1\right\}.$$

Note that $\mu_1 \in [\mu_1]_{j,C,\mathcal{A}}$. Also, we define $t_1^{[\mu_1]_{j,C,\mathcal{A}}} = (t^\mu)_{\mu \in [\mu_1]_{j,C,\mathcal{A}}}$, where repeated coordinates are only included once. I.e., $t_1^{[\mu_1]_{j,C,\mathcal{A}}}$ consists of those coordinates t_j such that $e_j^\mu \neq 0$ for some $\mu \in [\mu_1]_{j,C,\mathcal{A}}$. We let $t_2^{[\mu_1]_{j,C,\mathcal{A}}}$ be the rest of the coordinates, so that $t = \left(t_1^{[\mu_1]_{j,C,\mathcal{A}}}, t_2^{[\mu_1]_{j,C,\mathcal{A}}}\right)$. Finally, we say $\mu_1 \prec_{j,C,\mathcal{A}} \mu_2$ if $\mu_1 \preceq_{j,C,\mathcal{A}} \mu_2$ but we do not have $\mu_2 \preceq_{j,C,\mathcal{A}} \mu_1$.

Definition 4.4. We define $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}(N, e, a, \mathcal{A})$ to be the set of all distributions, K, such that there exists a $C \geq 1$ such that K can be written in the form

$$K = \sum_{j \in -\log_2 \mathcal{A}} \varsigma_j^{(2^j)}, \tag{4.4}$$

where $\{\varsigma_j\} \subset C_0^\infty\left(B^N(a)\right)$ is a bounded set, satisfying the following cancellation conditions: for every $j \in -\log_2 \mathcal{A}$, and every μ such that μ is not $j, \mathcal{A}$-minimal, and there does not exist a μ' with $\mu \prec_{j,C,\mathcal{A}} \mu'$, then we assume

$$\int \varsigma_j(t)\, dt_1^{[\mu]_{j,C,\mathcal{A}}} = 0; \tag{4.5}$$

otherwise, we allow the integral to be possibly non-zero.

Remark 4.5. Note that it is evident that $\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}(N, e, a, \mathcal{A}) \subseteq \mathcal{K}(N, e, a, \mathcal{A})$.

In Section 16 we further discuss the class $\mathcal{K}$, though the results there will not be used in the rest of the paper. In particular, we discuss following facts:

1. Every sum of the form (4.4) converges in the sense of distributions.
2. $\delta_0 \in \mathcal{K}\left(N, e, a, [0,1]^\nu\right)$.
3. Product kernels (in particular Calderón-Zygmund kernels) and flag kernels (see Definitions 16.4 and 16.6 and [NRS01]) are special cases of $\mathcal{K}$. Indeed, product kernels (with support in $B^N(a)$) are the case when each e_j is nonzero in precisely one component, and $\mathcal{A} = [0,1]^\nu$ (this is a result of [NRS01]). Similarly, flag kernels are the kernels with the same e but with $\mathcal{A} = \left\{\delta \in [0,1]^\nu : \delta_1 \geq \delta_2 \geq \cdots \geq \delta_\nu\right\}$. Note that, as in Remark 4.3, our main theorem will apply to a larger class of γ when considering K a flag kernel, than it will when considering K a product kernel. See Section 17.6 for more details on this.
4. There are interesting kernels which are neither product kernels nor flag kernels which are of the form $\mathcal{K}(N, e, a, \mathcal{A})$–see the end of Section 16 for an example.

5 Multi-parameter Carnot-Carathéodory geometry

At the heart of the conditions we will assume on γ lies multi-parameter Carnot-Carathéodory geometry. Thus, before we can even define the class of γ we will study, it is necessary to review the relevant definitions of multi-parameter Carnot-Carathéodory balls. We defer the theorems we will use to deal with these balls to Section 11. Our main reference for Carnot-Carathéodory geometry is [Str11], and we refer the reader there for a more detailed discussion.

Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a fixed open set, and suppose $X_1, \ldots, X_q$ are C^∞ vector fields on Ω. We define the Carnot-Carathéodory ball of unit radius, centered at $x_0 \in \Omega$, with respect to the list X by

$$\begin{aligned} B_X(x_0) := \Bigg\{ y \in \Omega \,\Bigg|\, & \exists \gamma : [0,1] \to \Omega, \gamma(0) = x_0, \gamma(1) = y, \\ & \gamma'(t) = \sum_{j=1}^q a_j(t) X_j(\gamma(t)), a_j \in L^\infty([0,1]), \\ & \left\| \left(\sum_{1 \leq j \leq q} |a_j|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^\infty([0,1])} < 1 \Bigg\}. \end{aligned}$$

Now that we have the definition of balls with unit radius, we may define (multi-parameter) balls of any radius merely by scaling the vector fields. To do so, we assign to each vector field, X_j, a (multi-parameter) formal degree $0 \neq d_j = \left(d_j^1, \ldots, d_j^\nu\right) \in [0,\infty)^\nu$. For $\delta = (\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_\nu) \in [0,\infty)^\nu$, we define the list of vector fields δX to be the list $\left(\delta^{d_1} X_1, \ldots, \delta^{d_q} X_q\right)$. Here, δ^{d_j} is defined by the standard multi-index notation: $\delta^{d_j} = \prod_{\mu=1}^\nu \delta_\mu^{d_j^\mu}$. We define the ball of radius δ centered at $x_0 \in \Omega$ by

$$B_{(X,d)}(x_0, \delta) := B_{\delta X}(x_0).$$

At times, it will be convenient to assume that the ball $B_{(X,d)}(x_0, \delta)$ lies "inside" of Ω. To this end, we make the following definition.

Definition 5.1. Given $x_0 \in \Omega$ and $\Omega' \subseteq \Omega$, we say the list of vector fields X satisfies $\mathcal{C}(x_0, \Omega')$ if for every $a = (a_1, \ldots, a_q) \in \left(L^\infty([0,1])\right)^q$, with

$$\left\| |a| \right\|_{L^\infty([0,1])} = \left\| \left(\sum_{j=1}^q |a_j| \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^\infty([0,1])} < 1,$$

there exists a solution $\gamma : [0,1] \to \Omega'$ to the ODE

$$\gamma'(t) = \sum_{j=1}^q a_j(t) X_j(\gamma(t)), \quad \gamma(0) = x_0.$$

Note, by Gronwall's inequality, when this solution exists, it is unique. Similarly, we say (X, d) satisfies $\mathcal{C}(x_0, \delta, \Omega')$ if δX satisfies $\mathcal{C}(x_0, \Omega')$.

One of the main points of [Str11] was to provide a detailed study of the balls $B_{(X,d)}(x_0, \delta)$, under appropriate conditions on the list (X, d). To do this, we first need to pick a subset $\mathcal{A} \subseteq [0,1]^\nu$, and a compact set $K_0 \Subset \Omega$.[17] We will (essentially) be restricting our attention to those balls $B_{(X,d)}(x_0, \delta)$ such that $x_0 \in K_0$ and $\delta \in \mathcal{A}$ (this $\mathcal{A}$ is the *same* set as in Section 4).

Definition 5.2. We say (X, d) satisfies $\mathcal{D}(K_0, \mathcal{A})$ if the following holds:

- Take Ω' with $K_0 \Subset \Omega' \Subset \Omega$ and $\xi > 0$ such that for every $\delta \in \mathcal{A}$ and $x \in K_0$, (X, d) satisfies $\mathcal{C}(x, \xi\delta, \Omega')$.
- For every $\delta \in \mathcal{A}$ and $x \in K_0$, we assume
$$\left[\delta^{d_i} X_i, \delta^{d_j} X_j\right] = \sum_k c_{i,j}^{k,\delta,x} \delta^{d_k} X_k, \text{ on } B_{(X,d)}(x, \xi\delta).$$
- For every ordered multi-index α we assume[18]
$$\sup_{\substack{\delta \in \mathcal{A} \\ x \in K_0}} \left\| (\delta X)^\alpha c_{i,j}^{k,x,\delta} \right\|_{C^0\left(B_{(X,d)}(x,\xi\delta)\right)} < \infty.$$

If we wish to be explicit about Ω' and ξ, we write $\mathcal{D}(K_0, \mathcal{A}, \Omega', \xi)$.

It is under condition $\mathcal{D}(K_0, \mathcal{A})$ that the balls $B_{(X,d)}(x, \delta)$ were studied in [Str11]. We refer the reader to Section 11 for an overview of the theorems from [Str11] that we shall use.

In what follows, we will not be directly given a list of vector fields with formal degrees satisfying $\mathcal{D}(K_0, \mathcal{A})$,
$$(X_1, d_1), \ldots, (X_q, d_q),$$
but, rather, we will be given a list of C^∞ vector fields with formal degrees which we will assume to "generate" such a list.

To understand this, let $(X_1, d_1), \ldots, (X_r, d_r)$ be C^∞ vector fields with associated formal degrees $0 \neq d_j \in [0, \infty)^\nu$. For a list $L = (l_1, \ldots, l_m)$ where $1 \leq l_j \leq r$, we define,
$$\begin{aligned} X_L &= \operatorname{ad}(X_{l_1}) \operatorname{ad}(X_{l_2}) \cdots \operatorname{ad}\left(X_{l_{m-1}}\right) X_{l_m}, \\ d_L &= d_{l_1} + d_{l_2} + \cdots + d_{l_m}. \end{aligned}$$

We define $\mathcal{S} = \{(X_L, d_L) : L \text{ is any such list}\}$.

Definition 5.3. We say $\mathcal{S}$ is *finitely generated* or that $(X_1, d_1), \ldots, (X_r, d_r)$ *generates a finite list* if there exists finite subset, $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$, such that $\mathcal{F}$ satisfies $\mathcal{D}(K_0, \mathcal{A})$[19] and
$$(X_j, d_j) \in \mathcal{F}, \quad 1 \leq j \leq r.$$

If we enumerate the vector fields in $\mathcal{F}$,
$$\mathcal{F} = \{(X_1, d_1), \ldots, (X_q, d_q)\},$$
we say that $(X_1, d_1), \ldots, (X_r, d_r)$ *generates the finite list* $(X_1, d_1), \ldots, (X_q, d_q)$. Note that, if $\mathcal{S}$ is finitely generated, $(X_1, d_1), \ldots (X_r, d_r)$ could generate many different finite lists. However, if we let (X, d) and (X', d') be two different such lists then either choice will work for our purposes. In fact, it is easy to see that (X, d) and (X', d') are *equivalent* in the sense discussed in Section 11.1. It follows from the discussion in Section 11.1, in every place we use these notions, it will not make a difference which finite list we use. Thus, we will unambiguously say "$(X_1, d_1), \ldots, (X_r, d_r)$ generates the finite list $(X_1, d_1), \ldots, (X_q, d_q)$," to mean that $(X_1, d_1), \ldots, (X_r, d_r)$ generates a finite list and $(X_1, d_1), \ldots, (X_q, d_q)$ can be any such list.

---

[17] One should think of K_0 as the closure of a small open set, on which the operator of study is supported; i.e., the Schwartz kernel of the operator we are studying will be supported in $K_0 \times K_0$.

[18] We write $\|f\|_{C^0(U)} := \sup_{x \in U} |f(x)|$, and if we say the norm is finite, we mean (in addition) that f is continuous on U.

[19] Here, we are thinking of K_0 and $\mathcal{A}$ fixed.

Remark 5.4. We can rephrase the above in the following way. We iteratively take commutators of the X_js and assign formal degrees as above. The assumption that $(X_1, d_1), \ldots, (X_r, d_r)$ generates a finite list says that after a finite number of steps, one "does not get anything new." For an example of how a list $(X_1, d_1), \ldots, (X_r, d_r)$ might not generate a finite list, see Section 17.6.

6 Surfaces

In this section, we define the class γ for which we will study operators of the form (1.1). The functions we study generalize the ones studied in [CNSW99]: even in the single parameter case, when K is a Calderón-Zygmund kernel, our class of γ is somewhat wider that those studied in [CNSW99] (cf. the special case in Section 3).

In [CNSW99] a number of equivalent "curvature conditions" on γ are defined under which the single-parameter version of operators of the form (1.1) are studied. We discuss some of these conditions in Section 9. Unfortunately, the most convenient way (for our purposes) to look at these conditions was not directly studied in [CNSW99]. In Section 9 we define and discuss a new curvature condition, $(\mathcal{C}_Z)$, which is equivalent to the other curvature conditions in [CNSW99]. In this section, we jump straight to the generalization of $(\mathcal{C}_Z)$ to the multi-parameter situation.[20]

We assume that we are given an open subset $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and a subset $\mathcal{A} \subseteq [0,1]^\nu$ (such that if $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in \mathcal{A}$, then $\delta_1 \vee \delta_2 \in \mathcal{A}$), and ν-parameter dilations e as in Section 4.

Definition 6.1. Given a multi-index $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^N$, we define,

$$\deg(\alpha) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \alpha_j e_j \in [0, \infty)^\nu.$$

Let $K_0 \Subset \Omega' \Subset \Omega'' \Subset \Omega$ be subsets of Ω with K_0 compact and Ω' and Ω'' open by relatively compact in Ω. Our goal in this section is to define a class of C^∞ functions

$$\gamma(t, x) : B^N(\rho) \times \Omega'' \to \Omega$$

such that $\gamma(0, x) \equiv x$. Here $\rho > 0$ is a small number. This class of functions will depend on $\mathcal{A}$, N, and e (it will also depend on K_0, Ω, Ω', and Ω''). This class will be such that if ψ is a C_0^∞ function supported on the interior of K_0, then there is an $a > 0$, sufficiently small, such that the operator given by (1.1) is bounded on L^2 for every $K \in \mathcal{K}(N, e, a, \mathcal{A})$.

As in Section 1, we will write $\gamma_t(x) = \gamma(t, x)$. Note, by possibly shrinking $\rho > 0$ we may assume that for every $t \in B^N(\rho)$, γ_t is a diffeomorphism onto its image. From now on we assume this, so that it makes sense to write γ_t^{-1} throughout the paper.

Unlike the work in [CNSW99], we separate the conditions on γ_t into two aspects. For the first, suppose we are given a list of C^∞ vector fields on Ω'', $X_1, \ldots, X_q$ with associated ν-parameter formal degrees $d_1, \ldots, d_q$ satisfying $\mathcal{D}(K_0, \mathcal{A}, \Omega', \xi)$ for some $\xi > 0$ (we will see later where these vector fields come from).

Definition 6.2. Suppose we are given a C^∞ vector field on Ω'', depending smoothly on $t \in B^N(\rho)$, $W(t, x) \in T_x\Omega''$. We say that (X, d) *controls* $W(t, x)$ if there exists $0 < \rho_1 \leq \rho$ and $0 < \tau_1 \leq \xi$ such that for every $x_0 \in K_0$, $\delta \in \mathcal{A}$, there exists functions $c_l^{x_0,\delta}$ on $B^N(\rho_1) \times B_{(X,d)}(x_0, \tau_1\delta)$ satisfying,

- $W(\delta t, x) = \sum_{l=1}^{q} c_l^{x_0,\delta}(t, x)\, \delta^{d_l} X_l(x)$ on $B^N(\rho_1) \times B_{(X,d)}(x_0, \tau_1\delta)$, where δt is defined as in (4.1).
- $\sup_{\substack{x_0 \in K_0 \\ \delta \in \mathcal{A}}} \sum_{|\alpha|+|\beta| \leq m} \left\| (\delta X)^\alpha \partial_t^\beta c_l^{x_0,\delta} \right\|_{C^0\left(B^N(\rho_1) \times B_{(X,d)}(x_0,\tau_1\delta)\right)} < \infty$, for every m.

---

[20] Strictly speaking, what follows is not a straight generalization of the curvature conditions in [CNSW99]. As mentioned in Section 3, our results will hold for a larger class of γ in the single-parameter case. However, it is reasonable to think of what follows as the multi-parameter "generalization" of the curvature conditions in [CNSW99].

Definition 6.3. We say (X,d) *controls* $\gamma_t(x)$ if (X,d) controls $W(t,x)$, where,

$$W(t,x)=\frac{d}{d\epsilon}\bigg|_{\epsilon=1}\gamma_{\epsilon t}\circ\gamma_t^{-1}(x);$$

here, $\epsilon t=(\epsilon t_1,\ldots,\epsilon t_n)$ and so has nothing to do with the dilations e.

Part of our assumption on γ will be that a particular list of vector fields (X,d) controls γ_t. Where these vector fields come from constitutes the other part of our assumption.

Let W be as in Definition 6.3. Let X_α be the Taylor coefficients of W when the Taylor series is taken in the t variable:

$$W(t)\sim\sum_\alpha t^\alpha X_\alpha, \tag{6.1}$$

so that X_α is a C^∞ vector field on Ω''.

Our assumption on γ is that if we take the set of vector fields with formal degrees:

$$\mathcal{V}=\{(X_\alpha,\deg(\alpha)):\deg(\alpha)\text{ is nonzero in only one component}\}, \tag{6.2}$$

then there is a finite subset $\mathcal{F}\subseteq\mathcal{V}$ such that $\mathcal{F}$ generates a finite list $(X,d)=(X_1,d_1),\ldots,(X_q,d_q)$, and this finite list controls γ.

Remark 6.4. The list of vector fields (X,d) depends on a few choices we have made in the above: it depends on the chosen subset $\mathcal{F}$ and it depends on the chosen list generated by $\mathcal{F}$. However, none of these choices affects (X,d) in an essential way. This is discussed in Section 11.2.

Remark 6.5. Note that the above assumptions are local. Indeed, if C is a large compact set, and if for each point $x_0\in C$, γ satisfies the above assumptions with K_0 some compact neighborhood of x_0, then γ satisfies the above assumptions with K_0 replaced by C. Thus, one should think of K_0 as a small neighborhood of a point. However, we find it more straightforward to fix K_0 in what follows, as opposed to letting it (possibly) shrink from line to line. We took the opposite perspective in Sections 1.1 and 2.

Remark 6.6. The "curvature conditions" in [CNSW99] are equivalent to saying $\{X_\alpha:\alpha\in\mathbb{N}^N\}$ satisfies Hörmander's condition (see $(\mathcal{C}_Z)$ in Section 9). We will see in Section 17.3 that this is a special case of the above assumptions, when $\nu=1$.

Remark 6.7. Note that our conditions on γ only involve the vector field W. It is not hard to see, though, that W uniquely determines γ. This is discussed further in Section 12.

Remark 6.8. Notice the scale invariance of Definition 6.3. Indeed, for $\delta_1,\delta_2\in\mathcal{A}$, the condition imposed on $W(\delta_1 t,x)$ is formally the same as the condition imposed on $W(\delta_2 t,x)$ provided one replaces $\delta_1 X$ with $\delta_2 X$. This scale invariance will play an essential role in our proofs. This also explains the entrance of Carnot-Carathéodory geometry in our assumptions: the Carnot-Carathéodory balls scale in the same way that our other assumptions scale.

Remark 6.9. Unlike in Section 2, we have not separated our assumptions on γ into a "finite type" condition and an "algebraic" condition. This distinction only has real significance when γ is real analytic, and we, therefore, differ discussion of it to [SS11b].

7 Statement of results

Fix $\Omega\subseteq\mathbb{R}^n$ open, and $K_0\Subset\Omega'\Subset\Omega''\Subset\Omega$ with K_0 compact (with nonempty interior) and Ω' and Ω'' open but relatively compact in Ω. Let

$$\gamma(t,x):B^N(\rho)\times\Omega''\to\Omega$$

be a C^∞ function such that $\gamma(0,x)\equiv x$. Here, $\rho>0$ is a small number.

Fix $\nu\in\mathbb{N}$ positive, and $\mathcal{A}\subseteq[0,1]^\nu$ such that for $\delta_1,\delta_2\in\mathcal{A}$, $\delta_1\vee\delta_2\in\mathcal{A}$. Furthermore, let $e=(e_1,\ldots,e_N)$ be given, with $0\neq e_j\in[0,\infty)^\nu$. We suppose γ satisfies the assumptions of Section 6 with this K_0, $\mathcal{A}$, and e.

Theorem 7.1. *For every* $\psi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ *supported in the interior of* K_0*, there exists* $a > 0$ *such that for every* $K \in \mathcal{K}(N, e, a, \mathcal{A})$ *the operator*

$$Tf(x) = \psi(x) \int f(\gamma_t(x)) K(t)\, dt \tag{7.1}$$

extends to a bounded operator $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \to L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$*.*

Actually, Theorem 7.1 follows directly from the following, slightly more general theorem.

Theorem 7.2. *There exists* $a > 0$ *such that for every* $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ *supported on the interior of* K_0*, every* $K \in \mathcal{K}(N, e, a, \mathcal{A})$ *and every* C^∞ *function*

$$\kappa(t, x) : B^N(a) \times \Omega'' \to \mathbb{C}$$

the operator

$$T(f)(x) = \psi_1(x) \int f(\gamma_t(x)) \psi_2(\gamma_t(x)) \kappa(t, x) K(t)\, dt \tag{7.2}$$

extends to a bounded operator $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \to L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$*.*

Proof of Theorem 7.1 given Theorem 7.2. Given ψ take ψ_2 to be equal to 1 on a neighborhood of the support of ψ. It is easy to see that if K has sufficiently small support, then $\psi_2(\gamma_t(x)) = 1$ on the domain of integration in (7.2) (with ψ in place of ψ_1). Recall that K is supported in $B^N(a)$, and so this may be achieved by shrinking a. Taking $\kappa \equiv 1$ yields Theorem 7.1. $\square$

Remark 7.3. The reason we work with Theorem 7.2 is that the class of operators given by (7.2) is closed under adjoints, while the class of operators given by (7.1) is not. This may not be immediately obvious from our assumptions. See Section 12.3 for details.

Remark 7.4. In the second paper in this series (joint with Elias Stein [SS11a]), we will prove a corresponding L^p theorem ($1 < p < \infty$). The operators for the L^p theorem will not be as general as those covered by Theorem 7.2: we will need to assume a special form for the set $\mathcal{A}$. However, $\mathcal{A} = [0,1]^\nu$ is of this form, and so in that special case, the results of Theorem 7.2 do extend to L^p.

8 Basic Notation

Throughout the paper, for $v = (v_1, \ldots, v_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we write $|v|$ for $\left(\sum_j |v_j|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, and we write $|v|_\infty$ for $\sup_j |v_j|$. $B^n(\eta)$ will denote the ball of radius $\eta > 0$ in the $|\cdot|$ norm. For two numbers $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ we write $a \vee b$ for the maximum of a and b and $a \wedge b$ for the minimum. If instead, $a = (a_1, \ldots, a_n), b = (b_1, \ldots, b_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we write $a \vee b$ (respectively, $a \wedge b$) for $(a_1 \vee b_1, \ldots, a_n \vee b_n)$ (respectively, $(a_1 \wedge b_1, \ldots, a_n \wedge b_n)$).

For a vectors $\delta = (\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_\nu), d = (d_1, \ldots, d_\nu) \in \mathbb{R}^\nu$, we define δ^d by the standard multi-index notation. I.e., $\delta^d = \prod_{\mu=1}^{\nu} \delta_\mu^{d_\mu}$. Also we will write $2^d = \left(2^{d_1}, \ldots, 2^{d_\nu}\right)$.

Given a, possibly arbitrary, set $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and a continuous function f defined on a neighborhood of U, we write

$$\|f\|_{C^j(U)} = \sum_{|\alpha| \le j} \sup_{x \in U} |\partial_x^\alpha f(x)|,$$

and if we state that $\|f\|_{C^j(U)}$ is finite, we mean that the partial derivatives up to order j of f exist on U, are continuous, and the above norm is finite. If f is replaced by a vector field $Y = \sum_k a_k(x) \partial_{x_k}$, then we write,

$$\|Y\|_{C^j(U)} = \sum_k \|a_k\|_{C^j(U)}.$$

Given two integers $1 \le m \le n$, we let $\mathcal{I}(m, n)$ denote the set of all lists of integers $(i_1, \ldots, i_m)$ such that

$$1 \le i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_m \le n.$$

Furthermore, suppose A is an $n \times q$ matrix, and suppose $1 \leq n_0 \leq n \wedge q$. For $I \in \mathcal{I}(n_0, n)$, $J \in \mathcal{I}(n_0, q)$ we let $A_{I,J}$ denote the $n_0 \times n_0$ matrix given by taking the rows from A which are listed in I and the columns from A which are listen in J. We define

$$\det_{n_0 \times n_0} A = (\det A_{I,J})_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{I}(n_0,n) \\ J \in \mathcal{I}(n_0,q)}},$$

so that, in particular, $\det_{n_0 \times n_0} A$ is a *vector* (it will not be important to us in which order the coordinates are arranged). $\det_{n_0 \times n_0} A$ comes up when one changes variables. Indeed, suppose Φ is a C^1 diffeomorphism from an open subset $U \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_0}$ mapping to an n_0 dimensional submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^n$, where this submanifold is given the induced Lebesgue measure dx. Then, we have

$$\int_{\Phi(U)} f(x)\, dx = \int_U f(\Phi(t)) \left| \det_{n_0 \times n_0} d\Phi(t) \right| dt.$$

If $A = (A_1, \ldots, A_q)$ is a list of, possibly non-commuting, operators, we will use ordered multi-index notation to define A^α, where α is a list of numbers $1, \ldots, q$. $|\alpha|$ will denote the length of the list. For instance, if $\alpha = (1, 4, 4, 2, 1)$, then $|\alpha| = 5$ and $A^\alpha = A_1 A_4 A_4 A_2 A_1$. Thus, if $A_1, \ldots A_q$ are vector fields, then A^α is an $|\alpha|$ order partial differential operator.

If $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^m$ is a map, then we write,

$$df(x)\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}\right),$$

for the differential of f at the point x applied to the vector field $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}$. If f is a function of two variables, $f(t,x) : \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^m$, and we wish to view df as a linear transformation acting on the vector space spanned by $\frac{\partial}{\partial_{t_j}}$ $(1 \leq j \leq N)$, then we instead write,

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial t}(t,x)$$

to denote this linear transformation. Hence, it makes sense to write,

$$\det_{n_0 \times n_0} \frac{\partial f}{\partial t}(t,x),$$

where $n_0 \leq m \wedge N$.

Finally, we will devote a good deal of notation to multi-parameter Carnot-Carathéodory geometry. See Sections 5 and 11.

9 The work of Christ, Nagel, Stein, and Wainger

In this section we review some of the aspects of the fundamental work [CNSW99], and we also discuss some further results that follow easily from that work, which will be useful in the multi-parameter setting. The results of this section will be of use to us in two ways. First, the work in [CNSW99] offered the primary inspiration for the results in this paper, and a review of these results will offer the reader much better context in which to understand this paper. Second, we will be able to save quite a bit of effort by "transferring" some of the single parameter results from [CNSW99] to the multi-parameter setting. For an example of this "transferring" in a simpler context, see Section 5.2.4 of [Str11].

In [CNSW99], operators of the form,

$$Tf(x) = \psi(x) \int f(\gamma_t(x))\, K(t)\, dt \tag{9.1}$$

were studied, where ψ is a cutoff function supported near a fixed point $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, K is a Calderón-Zygmund kernel supported near $t = 0$, and $\gamma : \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is a C^∞ function[21] with $\gamma_0(x) \equiv x$ and satisfying an additional condition, denoted by $(\mathcal{C})$ in [CNSW99].

---

[21] Actually, we only need γ defined near $0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Moreover, [CNSW99] showed that $(\mathcal{C})$ could be viewed as any one of a number of equivalent conditions. Three of their conditions are useful for our purposes. We review these three below, along with a fourth condition (not directly studied in [CNSW99]) which is also equivalent to the other three.

- $(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}})$: [CNSW99] showed that γ_t can be written asymptoticly as:[22]

  $$\gamma_t(x) \sim \exp\left(\sum_{|\alpha|>0} t^\alpha \widehat{X}_\alpha\right) x, \tag{9.2}$$

  where each $\widehat{X}_\alpha$ is a C^∞ vector field on $\mathbb{R}^n$ (see Theorem 8.5 of [CNSW99]). Condition $(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}})$ then states that the vector fields $\widehat{X}_\alpha$ satisfy Hörmander's condition. I.e., that the Lie algebra generated by the $\widehat{X}_\alpha$ spans the tangent space to $\mathbb{R}^n$ at x_0.

- $(\mathcal{C}_J)$: One defines $\Gamma : \mathbb{R}^{Nn} \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ by

  $$\Gamma(\tau, x) = \gamma_{t^1} \circ \gamma_{t^2} \circ \cdots \circ \gamma_{t^n}(x), \tag{9.3}$$

  where $\tau = \left(t^1, \ldots, t^n\right) \in \mathbb{R}^{Nn}$. $(\mathcal{C}_J)$ then states that for some multi-index β, we have,

  $$\left|\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau}\right)^\beta \det_{n\times n} \frac{\partial \Gamma}{\partial \tau}(\tau, x_0)\Big|_{\tau=0}\right| \neq 0.$$

- $(\mathcal{C}_Y)$:[23] For $1 \leq j \leq N$, define the C^∞ vector fields,

  $$W_j(t,x) = d\gamma\left(t, \gamma_t^{-1}(x)\right)\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t_j}\right) = \frac{\partial}{\partial s_j}\Big|_{s=0} \gamma_{t+s} \circ \gamma_t^{-1}(x).$$

  We now express W_j as a Taylor series in the t variable,

  $$W_j(t) \sim \sum_\alpha t^\alpha \frac{X_{\alpha,j}}{\alpha!},$$

  where $X_{\alpha,j}$ is a C^∞ vector field. $(\mathcal{C}_Y)$ then states that the vector fields $\{X_{\alpha,j} : |\alpha| \geq 0, 1 \leq j \leq N\}$ satisfy Hörmander's condition at x_0.

- $(\mathcal{C}_Z)$: Define the C^∞ vector field,[24]

  $$W(t,x) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \epsilon}\Big|_{\epsilon=1} \gamma_{\epsilon t} \circ \gamma_t^{-1}(x).$$

  Express W as a Taylor series in the t variable,

  $$W(t) \sim \sum_\alpha t^\alpha X_\alpha,$$

  where X_α is a C^∞ vector field. $(\mathcal{C}_Z)$ then states that the vector fields $\{X_\alpha\}$ satisfy Hörmander's condition at x_0.

The following result is mostly contained in [CNSW99]:

Theorem 9.1. $(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}) \Leftrightarrow (\mathcal{C}_J) \Leftrightarrow (\mathcal{C}_Y) \Leftrightarrow (\mathcal{C}_Z)$. *We denote by* $(\mathcal{C})$ *any of the above equivalent conditions.*

---

[22] (9.2) means that, for every M, $\gamma_t(x) = \exp\left(\sum_{0<|\alpha|<M} t^\alpha \widehat{X}_\alpha\right) + O\left(|t|^M\right)$, as $t \to 0$.

[23] See the bottom of page 521 of [CNSW99] to find $(\mathcal{C}_Y)$.

[24] Once again, $\epsilon t = (\epsilon t_1, \ldots, \epsilon t_n)$ and so does not use any non-standard dilations as in (4.1).

Proof. $(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}) \Leftrightarrow (\mathcal{C}_J)$ is contained in Theorem 8.8 of [CNSW99]. $(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}) \Leftrightarrow (\mathcal{C}_Y)$ is Proposition 9.6 of [CNSW99]. We are therefore left with showing only $(\mathcal{C}_Y) \Leftrightarrow (\mathcal{C}_Z)$ and the proof will be complete.

For a set of C^∞ vector fields $\mathcal{V}$, let $\mathrm{Lie}\,(\mathcal{V})$ denote the Lie algebra generated by $\mathcal{V}$. Let W_j, $X_{\alpha,j}$, W, and X_α be as in the definitions of $(\mathcal{C}_Y)$ and $(\mathcal{C}_Z)$. We will show,

$$\mathrm{Lie}\left\{X_{\alpha,j} : 1 \leq j \leq N, \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^N\right\} = \mathrm{Lie}\left\{X_\alpha : \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^N\right\},$$

which will complete the proof. In fact, we will show for every $M \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathrm{Lie}\left\{X_{\alpha,j} : 1 \leq j \leq N, |\alpha| \leq M\right\} = \mathrm{Lie}\left\{X_\alpha : |\alpha| \leq M+1\right\}. \tag{9.4}$$

We proceed by induction on M. It follows directly from the definition of W and W_j that,

$$W(t,x) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} t_j W_j(t,x). \tag{9.5}$$

In light of (9.5), the base case ($M=0$) of (9.4) is trivial. We assume we have (9.4) for $M-1$ and prove it for M. From (9.5), the containment $\supseteq$ is trivial, and so we prove only the containment $\subseteq$. To do so, we use the fact that γ satisfies the ODE in each variable,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t_j}\gamma_t(x) = W_j(t, \gamma_t(x)). \tag{9.6}$$

Hence, the W_j must satisfy the integrability condition:

$$\frac{\partial W_j}{\partial t_k} - \frac{\partial W_k}{\partial t_j} = [W_j, W_k]. \tag{9.7}$$

See, for example,[25] Theorem 10.9.4 of [Die60]. Let f_j be the multi-index which is 1 in the jth coordinate and 0 in all other coordinates. From, (9.7), we obtain,

$$\frac{X_{\alpha+f_k,j}}{\alpha!} - \frac{X_{\alpha+f_j,k}}{\alpha!} = \sum_{\gamma+\delta=\alpha}\left[\frac{X_{\gamma,j}}{\gamma!}, \frac{X_{\delta,k}}{\delta!}\right].$$

As a consequence, if $|\alpha| = M-1$, our inductive hypothesis shows,

$$X_{\alpha+f_k,j} - X_{\alpha+f_j,k} \equiv 0 \mod \mathrm{Lie}\left\{X_\alpha : |\alpha| \leq M\right\}. \tag{9.8}$$

Fix β with $|\beta| = M$. We wish to show $X_{\beta,j} \in \mathrm{Lie}\left\{X_\alpha : |\alpha| \leq M+1\right\}$. For every k such that $\beta - f_k \in \mathbb{N}^\nu$, we have by (9.8) (since $|\beta - f_k| = M-1$),

$$X_{\beta+f_j-f_k,k} \equiv X_{\beta,j} \mod \mathrm{Lie}\left\{X_\alpha : |\alpha| \leq M\right\}.$$

Applying (9.5), we see that the coefficient of $t^{\beta+f_j}$ in the Taylor series for W is given by,

$$X_{\beta+f_j} = \sum_{\substack{1\leq k\leq N\\ \beta-f_k\in\mathbb{N}^N}} \frac{X_{\beta+f_j-f_k,k}}{(\beta+f_j-f_k)!} \equiv C X_{\beta,j} \mod \mathrm{Lie}\left\{X_\alpha : |\alpha| \leq M\right\},$$

where C is a nonzero constant. Hence, $X_{\beta,j} \in \mathrm{Lie}\left\{X_\alpha : |\alpha| \leq M+1\right\}$, completing the proof. □

One of the main theorems of [CNSW99] is the following:

Theorem 9.2 (Theorem 11.1 of [CNSW99]). *Suppose γ satisfies $(\mathcal{C})$ at some point x_0, and suppose ψ is a C_0^∞ function supported on a sufficiently small neighborhood of x_0 and K is a standard Calderón-Zygmund kernel supported sufficiently close to* 0. *Then, the operator given by* (9.1) *extends to a bounded operator on L^p $(1 < p < \infty)$.*

---

[25] That (9.7) must hold follows simply by using the equality $\partial_{t_k}\partial_{t_j}\gamma_t = \partial_{t_j}\partial_{t_k}\gamma_t$ and applying (9.6).

Remark 9.3. We will use multi-parameter analogs of the concepts in the above four conditions. For example, the assumptions placed on γ in Section 6 is the relevant multi-parameter analog of $(\mathcal{C}_Z)$. We will discuss multi-parameter analogs of the other conditions described above, and a multi-parameter analog of Theorem 9.1, in Section 12.1.

As is discussed in Section 5.2.4 of [Str11], results in the single-parameter setting (like Theorem 9.1) can often be lifted to the multi-parameter setting, provided the results are uniform, in an appropriate sense. Fortunately, in this instance, the desired uniformity follows from Theorem 9.1 via a compactness argument. We now state and prove the main consequence of Theorem 9.1 which we will use.

For notational convenience, we take $x_0 = 0$ in what follows. We wish to define "uniform" versions of $(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}})$, $(\mathcal{C}_J)$, $(\mathcal{C}_Y)$, and $(\mathcal{C}_Z)$. Fix $\rho > 0$, $\eta > 0$, and let $\mathcal{S}$ be a set of C^∞ functions $\gamma : B^N(\rho) \times B^n(\eta) \to \mathbb{R}^n$, satisfying $\gamma_0(x) \equiv x$. We wish to define the notion of the above conditions holding uniformly for $\gamma \in \mathcal{S}$. We denote this by $\left(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^u\right)$, $(\mathcal{C}_J^u)$, $(\mathcal{C}_Y^u)$, and $(\mathcal{C}_Z^u)$ respectively.

- $\left(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^u\right)$: For $\gamma \in \mathcal{S}$, define $\widehat{X}_\alpha$ as in $(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}})$. $\left(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^u\right)$ states that there exists $M \in \mathbb{N}$, independent of $\gamma \in \mathcal{S}$, such that $\left\{\widehat{X}_\alpha : |\alpha| \leq M\right\}$ satisfies Hörmander's condition at 0, uniformly for $\gamma \in \mathcal{S}$. More precisely, that there exists $M' \in \mathbb{N}$, $c > 0$, independent of $\gamma \in \mathcal{S}$ such that if we let $V_1, \ldots, V_L$ denote the list of vector fields containing $\left\{\widehat{X}_\alpha : |\alpha| \leq M\right\}$, along with all commutators of the vector fields in $\left\{\widehat{X}_\alpha : |\alpha| \leq M\right\}$ up to order M', then we have,

  $$\left| \det_{n\times n} V(0) \right| \geq c,$$

  where we have written V to denote the matrix whose columns are $V_1, \ldots, V_L$.
- $(\mathcal{C}_J^u)$: For $\gamma \in \mathcal{S}$, define Γ as in $(\mathcal{C}_J)$. $(\mathcal{C}_J^u)$ then states that there is an $M \in \mathbb{N}$ and a $c > 0$, both independent of $\gamma \in \mathcal{S}$ such that for every $\gamma \in \mathcal{S}$ there exists β with $|\beta| \leq M$, and

  $$\left| \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau}\right)^\beta \det_{n\times n} \frac{\partial \Gamma}{\partial \tau}(\tau, 0) \bigg|_{\tau=0} \right| \geq c.$$
- $(\mathcal{C}_Y^u)$: For $\gamma \in \mathcal{S}$, define $X_{\alpha,j}$ as in $(\mathcal{C}_Y)$. $(\mathcal{C}_Y^u)$ states that there exists $M \in \mathbb{N}$, independent of $\gamma \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $\{X_{\alpha,j} : |\alpha| \leq M, 1 \leq j \leq N\}$ satisfies Hörmander's condition at 0, uniformly for $\gamma \in \mathcal{S}$ (as in $\left(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^u\right)$).
- $(\mathcal{C}_Z^u)$: For $\gamma \in \mathcal{S}$, define the vector fields $\{X_\alpha\}$ as in $(\mathcal{C}_Z)$. $(\mathcal{C}_Z^u)$ states that there exist $M \in \mathbb{N}$, independent of $\gamma \in \mathcal{S}$, such $\{X_\alpha : |\alpha| \leq M\}$ satisfies Hörmander's condition at 0, uniformly for $\gamma \in \mathcal{S}$ (as in $\left(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^u\right)$).

Theorem 9.4. *Let $\mathcal{S}$ be as above, and suppose $\mathcal{S} \subset C^\infty\left(B^N(\rho) \times B^n(\eta); \mathbb{R}^n\right)$ is a bounded set. Then, $\left(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^u\right) \Leftrightarrow (\mathcal{C}_J^u) \Leftrightarrow (\mathcal{C}_Y^u) \Leftrightarrow (\mathcal{C}_Z^u)$.*

Proof. We prove only $(\mathcal{C}_Z^u) \Rightarrow (\mathcal{C}_J^u)$ as that is the most important implication for our purposes. All of the other implications follow in a completely analogous manner. Suppose $\mathcal{S}$ satisfies $(\mathcal{C}_Z^u)$ but not $(\mathcal{C}_J^u)$. Let $\gamma^j \in \mathcal{S}$ be a sequence satisfying the following. Define Γ^j in terms of γ^j as in (9.3). We choose γ^j so that for every multi-index β with $|\beta| \leq j$, we have,

$$\left| \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau}\right)^\beta \det_{n\times n} \frac{\partial \Gamma^j}{\partial \tau}(\tau, 0) \right| \leq \frac{1}{j}.$$

This is clearly possible since $\mathcal{S}$ does not satisfy $(\mathcal{C}_J^u)$. Since bounded subsets of C^∞ are precompact, we may select a convergent subsequence $\gamma^j \to \gamma^\infty$. It is easy to verify (since $\mathcal{S}$ satisfies $(\mathcal{C}_Z^u)$) that γ^∞ satisfies $(\mathcal{C}_Z)$. It is also easy to see, by our choice of γ^j, that γ^∞ does not satisfy $(\mathcal{C}_J)$. This contradicts Theorem 9.1 and completes the proof. □

Remark 9.5. The reader might suspect that one could improve Theorem 9.4 by tracing through the proof in [CNSW99], and determining in precisely which way M and c (from $(\mathcal{C}_J^u)$) depend on the C^j norms of the elements of $\mathcal{S}$ and M_1, M_2, and c (from $(\mathcal{C}_Z^u)$). In fact, this is the case (at least if one replaces $(\mathcal{C}_J)$ with $(\mathcal{C}_J)'$ as defined in Definition 10.9 of [CNSW99]). One can use this to improve the way in which various constants depend on each other in this paper. However, this improvement would not change the main thrust of our results. Moreover, even if one does proceed in this manner, all of our results would still be far from optimal in this sense. We, therefore, leave such details to the interested reader.

10 Informal outline of the proof

Before we begin the rigorous proof of Theorem 7.2, in this section we offer an informal outline to help the reader see the big picture of what follows. We also highlight the difficulties that arise in the present work, that did not arise in previous works, such as [CNSW99]. We take all the same notation as in Theorem 7.2. Furthermore, for the purposes of this section, we imagine that the vector fields $X_1, \ldots, X_q$ span the tangent space at every point.[26] This will not be used in later sections, but it makes the informal description of the argument simpler. Letting $K \in \mathcal{K}(N, e, a, \mathcal{A})$ we may decompose K,

$$K = \sum_{j \in -\log_2 \mathcal{A}} \varsigma_j^{(2^j)}.$$

Defining,

$$T_j f(x) = \psi_1(x) \int f(\gamma_t(x)) \psi_2(\gamma_t(x)) \kappa(t,x) \varsigma_j^{(2^j)}(t)\, dt, \tag{10.1}$$

we wish to study the operator,

$$\sum_{j \in -\log_2 \mathcal{A}} T_j. \tag{10.2}$$

The goal is to show that (10.2) converges in the strong operator topology, as bounded operators on L^2. In fact, we will show that the family $\{T_j\}_{j\in\mathcal{A}}$ is an almost orthogonal family, and the result will then follow from the Cotlar-Stein lemma. More specifically, we will show,

$$\left\|T_k^* T_j\right\|_{L^2\to L^2}, \left\|T_j T_k^*\right\|_{L^2\to L^2} \lesssim 2^{-\epsilon|j-k|}, \tag{10.3}$$

for some $\epsilon > 0$, for every $j, k \in -\log_2 \mathcal{A}$. Theorem 7.2 follows directly from (10.3). In this section, we focus just on

$$\left\|T_k^* T_j\right\|_{L^2\to L^2} \lesssim 2^{-\epsilon|j-k|}, \tag{10.4}$$

the other inequality being similar. In what follows, we let $\epsilon > 0$ be a number that may change from line to line, but will always be independent of $j, k \in -\log_2 \mathcal{A}$.

(10.4) follows directly from the inequality,

$$\left\|\left(T_j^* T_k T_k^* T_j\right)^{n+1}\right\|_{L^2\to L^2} \lesssim 2^{-\epsilon|j-k|}, \tag{10.5}$$

where n is the dimension of the x-space. One has the trivial inequality,

$$\left\|\left(T_j^* T_k T_k^* T_j\right)^{n+1}\right\|_{L^1\to L^1} \lesssim 1, \tag{10.6}$$

and so interpolation with (10.6) shows that to prove (10.5) we need only prove,

$$\left\|\left(T_j^* T_k T_k^* T_j\right)^{n+1}\right\|_{L^\infty\to L^\infty} \lesssim 2^{-\epsilon|j-k|}. \tag{10.7}$$

We will see, for a fixed point x_0,

$$\left(T_j^* T_k T_k^* T_j\right)^{n+1} f(x_0) \tag{10.8}$$

---

[26] These are the vector fields from Section 6, obtained from the map γ.

depends only on the values of f on a small neighborhood, $U = U(j,k,x_0)$, of x_0 (later in the paper, we will have to be precise about how small a neighborhood).[27] Because of this, given j, k, and x_0, we will be able to construct a diffeomorphism,

$$\Phi = \Phi_{j,k,x_0} : B^n(\eta) \to U,$$

with $\Phi(0) = x_0$ and η is independent of j, k, and x_0. The point of this diffeomorphism will be to "rescale" (10.7) near the point x_0 so that it will follow from elementary considerations.

Let $\Phi^{\#} f(u) = f(\Phi(u))$. Then, to prove (10.7), it suffices to show,

$$\left|\Phi^{\#}\left(T_j^* T_k T_k^* T_j\right)^{n+1}\left(\Phi^{\#}\right)^{-1} g(0)\right| \lesssim 2^{-\epsilon|j-k|}\left\|g\right\|_{L^\infty}, \tag{10.9}$$

where $g = \Phi^{\#} f$. Here, the implicit constants in (10.9) cannot depend on the point x_0.

Remark 10.1. Later in the paper, we will not explicitly conjugate our operators by the pullback $\Phi^{\#}$. However, the way in which we proceed is equivalent to the above.

The map Φ will be defined in such a way that the effect of conjugating T_j by $\Phi^{\#}$ leaves one with an operator of the same form as T_j (though, with a different γ) but with j replaced by j', where $j' = j - j \wedge k$. With an abuse of notation, we call this new operator $T_{j'}$. Similarly, T_k is replaced by $T_{k'}$ where $k' = k - j \wedge k$.[28]

In this way, we can reduce (10.7) to the case when $j \wedge k = 0$ (provided one has good enough control of the implicit constant in (10.7)). More precisely, if we let,[29]

$$\theta_t(u) = \Phi^{-1} \circ \gamma_{2^{-j\wedge k}t} \circ \Phi(u),$$

then we are interested in the operator,

$$T_{j'} g(u) = \int g\left(\theta_{2^{-j'}t}(u)\right)\kappa(t,u)\varsigma_j(t)\, dt,$$

where κ is a C^∞ function (uniformly in any relevant parameters) and we have suppressed ψ_1 and ψ_2 since we are working locally. A similar formula holds for $T_{k'}$.

The diffeomorphism Φ will be defined in such a way that if we formally write,

$$\theta_t(u) \sim e^{\sum_{0<|\alpha|} t^\alpha Y_\alpha} u,$$

(see Section 9) then the vector fields

$$\left\{Y_\alpha : \deg(\alpha) \text{ is nonzero in precisely one component}\right\} \tag{10.10}$$

satisfy Hörmander's condition uniformly in any relevant parameters. Rewriting (10.10) using the fact that $j' \wedge k' = 0$, we see,

$$\left\{Y_\alpha : j' \cdot \deg(\alpha) = 0 \text{ or } k' \cdot \deg(\alpha) = 0\right\} \tag{10.11}$$

satisfy Hörmander's condition uniformly in any relevant parameters. Hence, writing,

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_{2^{-j'}t}(u) &\sim e^{\sum_{0<|\alpha|} t^\alpha 2^{-j'\cdot\deg(\alpha)} Y_\alpha} u, \\ \theta_{2^{-k'}t}(u) &\sim e^{\sum_{0<|\alpha|} t^\alpha 2^{-k'\cdot\deg(\alpha)} Y_\alpha} u, \end{aligned} \tag{10.12}$$

we see the set of vector fields in (10.12) which are not scaled satisfy Hörmander's condition. Because of this, it will be possible to apply the methods of [CNSW99] to the operator,

$$T_{j'}^* T_{k'} T_{k'}^* T_{j'},$$

to prove (10.9) and complete the proof.

---

[27] If the vector fields $X_1, \ldots, X_q$ do not span the tangent space at x_0, U would instead be a small neighborhood of x_0 on the leaf passing through x_0, generated by $X_1, \ldots, X_q$.

[28] Moreover, even in the case when $X_1, \ldots, X_q$ do not span the tangent space, the analogous vector fields associated to $T_{j'}$ and $T_{k'}$ do span the tangent space (uniformly in any relevant parameters).

[29] Φ will be defined in such a way that the map θ defined above is C^∞, uniformly in any relevant parameters.

Remark 10.2. In short, the above says that the map $\theta_{2^{-k'}t_1} \circ \theta_{2^{-j'}t_2}$ satisfies $(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}})$ uniformly in any relevant parameters. When we turn to the rigorous proof, it will be more convenient to use the (equivalent) fact that as j, k vary, the set of all such $\theta_{2^{-k'}t_1} \circ \theta_{2^{-j'}t_2}$ satisfies $(\mathcal{C}_Z^u)$. We will then be able to apply Theorem 9.4.

Remark 10.3. Note that we have used, in an essential way, that we are only considering those vector fields Y_α such that $j' \cdot \deg(\alpha) = 0$ or $k' \cdot \deg(\alpha) = 0$. This highlights the difference between the pure powers and non-pure powers discussed in Section 3.

We close this section by discussing some difficulties that arise in the multi-parameter situation, that did not arise in the single parameter situation of [CNSW99].

In [CNSW99] the Rothschild-Stein lifting procedure (see [RS76]) was used to "lift" the problem to a higher dimensional setting; in fact the problem was lifted to a high dimensional stratified Lie group. In this higher dimensional setting, the scaling map Φ had a very simple form: it was given by the standard dilations on this stratified Lie group. In the multi-parameter setting, this lifting argument creates more difficulties than it alleviates. In particular, it is unclear how to consider the non-pure powers, nor how to naturally deal with the multi-parameter dilations. Because of this, we must work directly with a more complicated scaling map Φ. This map was defined and studied in [Str11], and we review the relevant theory in Section 11. As a consequence, the lifting procedure is not necessary to prove the results of [CNSW99]. The single-parameter version of the results in [Str11] were first obtained in [NSW85]. Using the scaling maps from [NSW85], one can (with some reordering of the proof) recreate the entire theory of [CNSW99] without resorting to the lifting procedure.

In the single-parameter case, one is given two numbers $j, k \in \mathbb{N}$, and one wishes to show, for instance,

$$\|T_k^* T_j\|_{L^2 \to L^2} \lesssim 2^{-\epsilon|j-k|}.$$

When, for instance, $k \leq j$, it suffices to show,

$$\left\| \left(T_k T_k^*\right)^M T_j \right\|_{L^2 \to L^2} \lesssim 2^{-\epsilon|j-k|};$$

for some large, but fixed, M. In the multi-parameter situation, however, it could be that some coordinates of j are greater than those of k, while the opposite is true for other coordinates. Because of this, we must instead show,

$$\left\| \left(T_j^* T_k T_k^* T_j\right)^M \right\|_{L^2 \to L^2} \lesssim 2^{-\epsilon|j-k|}.$$

This turns out to be more of a notational difficulty than anything else.

10.1 Diffeomorphism invariance

The assumptions of Theorem 7.2 are invariant under diffeomorphisms. More precisely, if we let T be the operator in Theorem 7.2, and if we let $\Psi : \Omega \to \widetilde{\Omega}$ be a diffeomorphism, then the operator $\left(\Psi^\#\right)^{-1} T \Psi^\#$ satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 7.2. This is straightforward to check.

It turns out that more is true. Denote by $\widetilde{T}$ the map $\left(\Psi^\#\right)^{-1} T \Psi^\#$, and by $\widetilde{T}_j$ the map $\left(\Psi^\#\right)^{-1} T_j \Psi^\#$, where T_j is as in Section 10. Note that $\widetilde{T} = \sum_{j \in -\log_2 \mathcal{A}} \widetilde{T}_j$, and in fact if we had applied the proof in Section 10 to $\widetilde{T}$, this is the decomposition of $\widetilde{T}$ we would have used. Fix j, k, and x_0 as in Section 10. Let Φ be the scaling map associated to T_j, T_k at x_0, and let $\widetilde{\Phi}$ denote the scaling map associated to $\widetilde{T}_j, \widetilde{T}_k$ at $\Psi(x_0)$. It is not hard to see, from the definition of Φ in Section 11 that,

$$\widetilde{\Phi} = \Psi \circ \Phi.$$

Thus, we have,

$$\widetilde{\Phi}^\# \widetilde{T}_j \left(\widetilde{\Phi}^\#\right)^{-1} = \Phi^\# \Psi^\# \left(\Psi^\#\right)^{-1} T_j \Psi^\# \left(\Psi^\#\right)^{-1} \left(\Phi^\#\right)^{-1} = \Phi^\# T_j \left(\Phi^\#\right)^{-1};$$

with a similar result for T_k and $\widetilde{T}_k$. Thus, one obtains the *same* operators when pulling back T_j and T_k via Φ as when pulling back $\widetilde{T}_j$ and $\widetilde{T}_k$ via $\widetilde{\Phi}$. Hence, not only are the assumptions of Theorem 7.2 invariant under diffeomorphisms, but a large part of the proof actually remains completely unchanged when conjugated by a diffeomorphism.

11 Multi-parameter Carnot-Carathéodory geometry revisited

In this section, we present the results that allow us to deal with Carnot-Carathéodory geometry. The results we outline here are contained in Section 4 of [Str11]. The heart of this theory is the ability to "rescale" vector fields. This rescaling is obtained by pulling back via a particular diffeomorphism, which will be denoted by Φ in what follows.

Before we can enter into details, we must explain the connection between multi-parameter balls and single-parameter balls. We assume we are given C^∞ vector fields $X_1, \ldots, X_q$ with associated formal degrees $0 \neq d_1, \ldots, d_q \in [0,\infty)^\nu$. Here, $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$ is the number of parameters. Given the multi-parameter degrees, we obtain corresponding single parameter degrees, which we denote by $\sum d$ and are defined by $\left(\sum d\right)_j := \sum_{\mu=1}^{\nu} d_j^\mu = |d_j|_1$. Let $\delta \in [0,\infty)^\nu$, and suppose we wish to study the ball

$$B_{(X,d)}\left(x_0, \delta\right).$$

Decompose $\delta = \delta_0 \delta_1$ where $\delta_0 \in [0,\infty)$ and $\delta_1 \in [0,\infty)^\nu$ (of course this decomposition is not unique). Then, directly from the definition, we obtain:

$$B_{(X,d)}\left(x_0, \delta\right) = B_{\left(\delta_1 X, \sum d\right)}\left(x_0, \delta_0\right) = B_{\left(\delta X, \sum d\right)}\left(x_0, 1\right).$$

Thus, studying a ball of radius δ corresponding to (X,d) is the same as studying a ball of radius 1 corresponding to $\left(\delta X, \sum d\right)$. For this reason, taking K_0 and $\mathcal{A}$ as in Section 5 and assuming (X,d) satisfies $\mathcal{D}\left(K_0, \mathcal{A}\right)$, we will fix $x_0 \in K_0$ and $\delta \in \mathcal{A}$ and study balls of radius ≈ 1 centered at x_0 corresponding to the vector fields with single-parameter formal degrees $\left(\delta X, \sum d\right)$. In what follows, it will be important that all of the implicit constants are independent of $x_0 \in K_0$ and $\delta \in \mathcal{A}$.

We now turn to stating a theorem about a list of C^∞ vector fields $Z_1, \ldots, Z_q$ defined on an open set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, with associated single parameter formal degrees $\tilde{d}_1, \ldots, \tilde{d}_q \in (0,\infty)$. The special case we are interested in is the case when $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right) = \left(\delta X, \sum d\right)$; i.e., when $Z_j = \delta^{d_j} X_j$ and $\tilde{d}_j = |d_j|_1$.

Fix $x_0 \in \Omega$ and $1 \geq \xi > 0$.[30] Let $n_0 = \dim \operatorname{span}\left\{Z_1\left(x_0\right), \ldots, Z_q\left(x_0\right)\right\}$. For $J = \left(j_1, \ldots, j_{n_0}\right) \in \mathcal{I}\left(n_0, q\right)$, let Z_J denote the list of vector fields $Z_{j_1}, \ldots, Z_{j_{n_0}}$. Fix $J_0 \in \mathcal{I}\left(n_0, q\right)$ such that

$$\left|\det_{n_0 \times n_0} Z_{J_0}\left(x_0\right)\right|_\infty = \left|\det_{n_0 \times n_0} Z\left(x_0\right)\right|_\infty,$$

where we have identified $Z\left(x_0\right)$ with the $n \times q$ matrix whose columns are given by $Z_1\left(x_0\right), \ldots, Z_q\left(x_0\right)$ and similarly for $Z_{J_0}\left(x_0\right)$. We assume $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right)$ satisfies $\mathcal{C}\left(x_0, \xi, \Omega\right)$. In addition we suppose that there are functions $c_{i,j}^k$ on $B_{\left(Z,\tilde{d}\right)}\left(x_0, \xi\right)$ such that

$$\left[Z_i, Z_j\right] = \sum c_{i,j}^k Z_k, \text{ on } B_{\left(Z,\tilde{d}\right)}\left(x_0, \xi\right).$$

We assume that:

- $\left\|Z_j\right\|_{C^m\left(B_{\left(Z,\tilde{d}\right)}\left(x_0,\xi\right)\right)} < \infty$ for every m.
- $\sum_{|\alpha| \leq m} \left\|Z^\alpha c_{i,j}^k\right\|_{C^0\left(B_{\left(Z,\tilde{d}\right)}\left(x_0,\xi\right)\right)} < \infty$, for every m and every i, j, k.

We say that C is an m-admissible constant if C can be chosen to depend only on upper bounds for the above two quantities (for that particular choice of m), m, upper and lower bounds for $\tilde{d}_1, \ldots, \tilde{d}_q$, an upper bound for n and q, and a lower bound for ξ. Note that, in our primary example $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right) = \left(\delta X, \sum d\right)$, m-admissible constants can be chosen independent of $x_0 \in K_0$ and $\delta \in \mathcal{A}$. We write $A \lesssim_m B$ if $A \leq CB$, where C is an m-admissible constant, and we write $A \approx_m B$ if $A \lesssim_m B$ and $B \lesssim_m A$. Finally, we say $\tau = \tau(\kappa)$ is an m-admissible constant if τ can be chosen to depend on all the parameters an m admissible constant may depend on, and τ may also depend on κ. The next result is contained in Section 4 of [Str11].

---

[30] In our primary example, one takes $x_0 \in K_0$ and ξ as in $\mathcal{D}\left(K_0, \mathcal{A}\right)$.

Theorem 11.1. *There exist* 2*-admissible constants* $\eta_1, \xi_1 > 0$ *such that if the map* $\Phi : B^{n_0}(\eta_1) \to B_{(Z,\tilde{d})}(x_0, \xi)$ *is defined by*

$$\Phi(u) = e^{u \cdot Z_{J_0}} x_0,$$

we have

- $\Phi : B^{n_0}(\eta_1) \to B_{(Z,\tilde{d})}(x_0, \xi)$ *is injective.*
- $B_{(Z,\tilde{d})}(x_0, \xi_1) \subseteq \Phi(B^{n_0}(\eta_1))$*.*

Furthermore, if we let Y_j *be the pullback of* Z_j *under the map* Φ*, then we have, for* $m \geq 0$*,*

$$\|Y_j\|_{C^m(B^{n_0}(\eta_1))} \lesssim_{m \vee 2} 1, \tag{11.1}$$

$$\|f\|_{C^m(B^{n_0}(\eta_1))} \approx_{(m-1)\vee 2} \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m} \|Y^\alpha f\|_{C^0(B^{n_0}(\eta_1))}. \tag{11.2}$$

Finally,

$$\left| \det_{n_0 \times n_0} Y(u) \right| \approx_2 1, \quad \forall u \in B^{n_0}(\eta_1). \tag{11.3}$$

Note that, in light of (11.1) and (11.3), pulling back by the map Φ allows us to rescale the vector fields Z in such a way that the rescaled vector fields, Y, are smooth and span the tangent space (uniformly in any relevant parameters). We will also need the following technical result.

Proposition 11.2. *Suppose* $\xi_2, \eta_2 > 0$ *are given. Then there exist* 2*-admissible constants* $\eta' = \eta'(\xi_2) > 0$*,* $\xi' = \xi'(\eta_2) > 0$ *such that,*

$$\Phi(B^{n_0}(\eta')) \subseteq B_{(Z,\tilde{d})}(x_0, \xi_2),$$

$$B_{(Z,\tilde{d})}(x_0, \xi') \subseteq \Phi(B^{n_0}(\eta_2)).$$

Proof. The existence of η' can be seen by applying Theorem 11.1 with ξ replaced by $\xi \wedge \xi_2$. The existence of ξ' can be shown by combining the proof of Proposition 3.21 of [Str11] with the proof of Proposition 4.16 of [Str11]. □

Remark 11.3. With a slight abuse of notation, when we say m-admissible constant, where $m < 2$, we will take that to mean a 2-admissible constant. Using this new notation, the $\vee$ in (11.1) and (11.2) may be removed.

Remark 11.4. One way to think about Theorem 11.1 is from the perspective of the classical Frobenius theorem. Indeed, the main assumption in Theorem 11.1 is essentially that the distribution generated by by $Z_1, \ldots, Z_q$ is involutive. One can view the map Φ as a coordinate chart on the leaf passing through x_0 generated by $Z_1, \ldots, Z_q$. Theorem 11.1 gives quantitative control of this coordinate chart. This is discussed in more detail in [Str11].

Remark 11.5. It is not hard to see that the single-parameter formal degrees $\tilde{d}$ do not play an essential role in the above (see Remark 3.3 of [Str11]). In fact, one could state Theorem 11.1, taking all the formals degrees $\tilde{d}_j = 1$ and that would be sufficient for our purposes. Moreover, in every place we use the single-parameter formal degrees $\tilde{d}$, they are inessential. We have stated the result as above, though, to allow us to transfer seamlessly between the vector fields (X, d) and $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right)$, without any hand-waving about the formal degrees.

11.1 Control of vector fields

In this section, we introduce a notion (closely related to Definition 6.3) to discuss when the list of vector fields with formal degrees "controls" a vector field with a formal degree (X_0, d_0). Informally, this means that if we were to add (X_0, d_0) to the list (X, d), we would not "get anything new." In particular, under the conditions we will define, we will not significantly increase the size of the balls $B_{(X,d)}(x_0, \delta)$ (we would, instead, obtain comparable balls), and Theorem 11.1 will hold with the same choice of the map Φ (when Theorem 11.1 is applied to $(\delta X, \sum d)$). Many of the results discussed in this section are discussed in more detail, and proved, in Sections 4.1 and 5.3 of [Str11], and we refer the reader there for more details.

Following in the philosophy of Section 11, we will state our definitions and results for single parameter vector fields $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right)$ near a fixed point $x_0 \in \Omega$, where one should think of the case $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right) = (\delta X, \sum d)$, where $\delta \in \mathcal{A}$ and $x_0 \in K_0$ (and all of the results and definitions hold uniformly in δ and x_0). We maintain all the same assumptions on $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right)$ (and associated notation) as in Section 11. In particular, Theorem 11.1 applies and we obtain 2-admissible constants η_1 and ξ_1 and a map Φ as in Theorem 11.1.

Suppose we are given a C^∞ vector field Z_0 with an associated single parameter formal degree $\tilde{d}_0$. Let $\left(Z', \tilde{d}'\right)$ denote the list of vector fields with formal degrees

$$\left(Z_0, \tilde{d}_0\right), \left(Z_1, \tilde{d}_1\right), \ldots, \left(Z_q, \tilde{d}_q\right):$$

the list of vector fields $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right)$ with $\left(Z_0, \tilde{d}_0\right)$ added. We introduce the following two conditions on $\left(Z_0, \tilde{d}_0\right)$ which turn out to be equivalent. All parameters that follow are assumed to be strictly positive real numbers:

1. $\mathcal{P}_1\left(\tau_1, \{\sigma_1^m\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}\right)$ $(\tau_1 \leq \xi_1)$: There exist $c_j \in C^0\left(B_{\left(Z,\tilde{d}\right)}(x_0, \tau_1)\right)$ such that:
    - $Z_0 = \sum_{j=1}^q c_j Z_j$, on $B_{\left(Z,\tilde{d}\right)}(x_0, \tau_1)$.
    - $\sum_{|\alpha|\leq m} \left\|(Z)^\alpha c_j\right\|_{C^0\left(B_{(Z,d)}(x_0,\tau_1)\right)} \leq \sigma_1^m$.
2. $\mathcal{P}_2\left(\eta_2, \{\sigma_2^m\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}\right)$ $(\eta_2 \leq \eta_1)$: Z_0 is tangent to the leaf passing through x_0 generated by $Z_1, \ldots, Z_q$, and moreover, if we let Y_0 be the pullback of Z_0 via the map Φ from Theorem 11.1, we have,

$$\|Y_0\|_{C^m(B^{n_0}(\eta_2))} \leq \sigma_2^m.$$

Proposition 11.6. *$\mathcal{P}_1 \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{P}_2$ in the following sense.*

- *$\mathcal{P}_1\left(\tau_1, \{\sigma_1^m\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}\right) \Rightarrow$ there exists a 2-admissible $\eta_2 = \eta_2(\tau_1) > 0$ and m-admissible constants $\sigma_2^m = \sigma_2^m(\sigma_1^m)$ such that $\mathcal{P}_2\left(\eta_2, \{\sigma_2^m\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}\right)$ holds.*
- *$\mathcal{P}_2\left(\eta_2, \{\sigma_2^m\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}\right) \Rightarrow$ there exists a 2-admissible constant $\tau_1 = \tau_1(\eta_2) > 0$ and m-admissible constants $\sigma_1^m = \sigma_1^m(\sigma_2^m)$ such that $\mathcal{P}_1\left(\tau_1, \{\sigma_1^m\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}\right)$ holds.*

Moreover, in the case that $\mathcal{P}_1\left(\tau_1, \{\sigma_1^m\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}\right)$ holds, we have the following.

- *There is a 2-admissible constant $\tau' = \tau'\left(\tilde{d}_0, \tau_1, \sigma_1^2\right)$, such that*

$$B_{\left(Z,\tilde{d}\right)}(x_0, \tau') \subseteq B_{\left(Z',\tilde{d}'\right)}(x_0, \tau') \subseteq B_{\left(Z,\tilde{d}\right)}(x_0, \tau_1).$$

- *The same map Φ satisfies all the conclusions of Theorem 11.1 with $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right)$ replaced by $\left(Z', \tilde{d}'\right)$.*

Proof. $\mathcal{P}_1 \Rightarrow \mathcal{P}_2$ follows just as in Proposition 4.19 of [Str11] (here $\mathcal{P}_1$ is related to $\mathcal{P}_3$ in [Str11]).

We now turn to $\mathcal{P}_2 \Rightarrow \mathcal{P}_1$. Take $\tau_1 = \tau_1(\eta_2)$ to be a 2-admissible constant so small that,

$$B_{(Z,\tilde{d})}(x_0, \tau_1) \subseteq \Phi\left(B^{n_0}(\eta_2)\right),$$

by applying Proposition 11.2. Let $Y_1, \ldots, Y_q$ be the pullbacks of $Z_1, \ldots, Z_q$ via the map Φ. Using (11.1) and (11.3), we may write,

$$Y_0 = \sum_{j=1}^{q} c_j Y_j, \text{ on } B^{n_0}(\eta_2), \tag{11.4}$$

with,

$$\sum_{|\alpha|\leq m} \left\|(Y)^{\alpha} c_j\right\|_{C^0(B^{n_0}(\eta_2))} \lesssim_m \left\|c_j\right\|_{C^m(B^{n_0}(\eta_2))} \lesssim \sigma_2^m. \tag{11.5}$$

Pushing (11.4) forward via the map Φ and combining it with the push-forward of (11.5) yields $\mathcal{P}_1$.

We now turn to the second part of the proposition: when $\mathcal{P}_1$ (or, equivalently, $\mathcal{P}_2$) holds, the above two conclusions hold. The first follows just as in Proposition 4.18 of [Str11]. For the second, note that in Theorem 11.1, we chose J_0 such that

$$\left|\det_{n_0\times n_0} Z_{J_0}(x_0)\right|_{\infty} = \left|\det_{n_0\times n_0} Z(x_0)\right|_{\infty};$$

however, the theory from [Str11] shows that we only need

$$\left|\det_{n_0\times n_0} Z_{J_0}(x_0)\right|_{\infty} \gtrsim \left|\det_{n_0\times n_0} Z(x_0)\right|_{\infty}.$$

Thus to show that the same map Φ can be used for $\left(Z', \tilde{d}'\right)$, we need only show,

$$\begin{aligned} &n_0 = \dim \operatorname{span}\left\{Z_0(x_0), \ldots, Z_q(x_0)\right\}, \\ &\left|\det_{n_0\times n_0} Z(x_0)\right|_{\infty} \gtrsim \left|\det_{n_0\times n_0} Z'(x_0)\right|_{\infty}. \end{aligned} \tag{11.6}$$

(11.6) follows from Theorem 4.17 of [Str11] (the $\mathcal{P}_3^0 \Rightarrow \mathcal{P}_1^0$ part of Theorem 4.17). □

Definition 11.7. We say $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right)$ controls $\left(Z_0, \tilde{d}_0\right)$ at the unit scale near x_0 if either of the above two equivalent conditions ($\mathcal{P}_1$ or $\mathcal{P}_2$) holds.

Definition 11.8. Let $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right) = \left(Z_1, \tilde{d}_1\right), \ldots, \left(Z_q, \tilde{d}_q\right)$ and $\left(Z', \tilde{d}'\right) = \left(Z'_1, \tilde{d}'_1\right), \ldots, \left(Z'_{q'}, \tilde{d}'_{q'}\right)$ be two lists of vector fields with single parameter formal degrees as above. We say $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right)$ controls $\left(Z', \tilde{d}'\right)$ at the unit scale near x_0 if $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right)$ controls $\left(Z'_j, \tilde{d}'_j\right)$ at the unit scale near x_0 for every $1 \leq j \leq q'$. We say $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right)$ and $\left(Z', \tilde{d}'\right)$ are equivalent at the unit scale near x_0 if $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right)$ controls $\left(Z', \tilde{d}'\right)$ at the unit scale near x_0 and $\left(Z', \tilde{d}'\right)$ controls $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right)$ at the unit scale near x_0.

Proposition 11.9. *If $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right)$ and $\left(Z', \tilde{d}'\right)$ are equivalent at the unit scale near x_0, and if Φ is the map obtained when applying Theorem 11.1 to the list $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right)$, then the same map Φ satisfies all the conclusions of Theorem 11.1 with $\left(Z', \tilde{d}'\right)$ in place of $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right)$ (with possibly different constants).*

Proof. The proof is an easy addition to Proposition 11.6, and we leave the details to the reader. □

Definition 11.10. Let $K_0 \Subset \Omega$ and $\mathcal{A} \subseteq [0,1]^\nu$ be as in Section 5, and let (X, d) be a list of C^∞ vector fields with ν-parameter formal degrees as in Section 5, satisfying $\mathcal{D}(K_0, \mathcal{A})$. Let X_0 be another C^∞ vector field with an associated formal degree $0 \neq d_0 \in [0, \infty)^\nu$. We say (X, d) *controls* (X_0, d_0) if for every $\delta \in \mathcal{A}$, $x_0 \in K_0$, $(\delta X, \sum d)$ controls $\left(\delta^{d_0} X_0, |d_0|_1\right)$ at the unit sale near x_0 in such a way that the parameters of $\mathcal{P}_1$ (equivalently $\mathcal{P}_2$) can be chosen to be independent of $x_0 \in \mathcal{K}$, $\delta \in \mathcal{A}$.

Remark 11.11. Note that $\mathcal{D}(K_0, \mathcal{A})$ is equivalent to saying that (X, d) controls $([X_i, X_j], d_i + d_j)$, for every $1 \leq i, j \leq q$.

Definition 11.10 is closely related to Definition 6.3. Indeed, we have the following proposition, whose proof we defer to Section 12.2.

Proposition 11.12. *Let* (X, d) *be as in Definition 11.10. Define,*

$$\gamma_t(x) = e^{\sum_{0<|\alpha|\leq L} t^\alpha V_\alpha} x,$$

where each V_α *is a* C^∞ *vector field. Then,* γ *is controlled by* (X, d) *if and only if* $(V_\alpha, \deg(\alpha))$ *is controlled by* (X, d) *for every* α.

Definition 11.13. Let $(X, d) = (X_1, d_1), \ldots, (X_1, d_q)$ and $(X', d') = (X_1', d_1'), \ldots, \left(X_{q'}', d_{q'}'\right)$ be two lists of vector fields with ν-parameter formal degrees satisfying $\mathcal{D}(K_0, \mathcal{A})$. We say (X, d) *controls* (X', d') if (X, d) controls $\left(X_j', d_j'\right)$ for every $1 \leq j \leq q'$. We say that (X, d) and (X', d') are *equivalent* if (X, d) controls (X', d') and (X', d') controls (X, d).

Remark 11.14. In Section 6, we singled out a list of vector fields with formal degrees (X, d). Throughout, we will use these vector fields to study γ. In everything that follows, and because of the results in this section, it would work just as well to replace (X, d) with an equivalent list (X', d') in our applications of Theorem 11.1.

11.2 More on (X, d)

Our assumptions in Section 6 above might make it seem that we have made some choices which affected the list (X, d). Specifically, we supposed that there existed a finite set $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ such that $\mathcal{F}$ generated a finite list (X, d) and this list controlled γ (here we are taking the notation from Section 6; in particular, $\mathcal{V}$ is given by (6.2)). One might expect that (X, d) depends on this choice of $\mathcal{F}$. However, this is not the case: given such a $\mathcal{F}$ and given $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ finite with $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{F}'$, then any finite list (X', d') generated by $\mathcal{F}'$ is equivalent to (X, d).[31] This follows from the following lemma, and the theory in Section 11.1.

Lemma 11.15. *Suppose* (X, d) *controls* γ. *Then, if* X_α *is as in* (6.1), (X, d) *controls* $(X_\alpha, \deg(\alpha))$.

Proof. This follows easily from the definitions. □

As is discussed in Section 11.1, in light of Lemma 11.15, one does not "get anything new" by adding $(X_\alpha, \deg(\alpha))$ to the list (X, d).

Because of the above, there is a more direct way to construct the list (X, d). Fix M large. One considers the set

$$\mathcal{F} = \left\{ (X_\alpha, \deg(\alpha)) : \deg(\alpha) \text{ is non-zero in only one component}, |\alpha| \leq M \right\}. \tag{11.7}$$

One then recursively assigns formal degrees to commutators of vector fields of $\mathcal{F}$ as follows: if X_1 has formal degree d_1 and X_2 has formal degree d_2, then $[X_1, X_2]$ is assigned formal degree $d_1 + d_2$. One then takes iterated commutators of the elements of $\mathcal{F}$, and we assume that, after taking all iterated commutators up to order M, the resulting finite list of vector fields with formal degrees satisfies $\mathcal{D}(K_0, \mathcal{A})$, and controls γ. The above discussion shows that if this is true for M, it is true for any larger choice of M, and the resulting finite lists of vector fields with formal degrees are equivalent.

---

[31] As already noted in Definition 5.3, given $\mathcal{F}$, all choices of (X, d) are equivalent.

12 Surfaces revisited

In this section, we introduce the technical results necessary to deal with our assumptions on γ in Section 6. Before we enter into details, we point out the formal connection between γ and W. Recall, from Section 6, $W(t,x)$ is defined by,

$$W(t,x) = \frac{d}{d\epsilon}\bigg|_{\epsilon=1} \gamma_{\epsilon t} \circ \gamma_t^{-1}(x). \tag{12.1}$$

From this we see that, given γ, we obtain a C^∞ vector field $W(t)$, depending smoothly on t, satisfying $W(0)=0$. The reverse is true as well:

Proposition 12.1. *The map $\gamma \mapsto W$ is a bijective map from smooth functions γ_t, with $\gamma_0(x) \equiv x$ (thought of as germs in the t variable), to smooth vector fields depending on t, $W(t)$, with $W(0)=0$ (also thought of as germs in the t variable).*

Proof. Let $\omega(\epsilon,t,x)$ be the (unique[32]) solution to the ODE:

$$\frac{d}{d\epsilon}\omega(\epsilon,t,x) = \frac{1}{\epsilon} W(\epsilon t, \omega(\epsilon,t,x)), \quad \omega(0,t,x) = x. \tag{12.2}$$

We will show that the (two-sided) inverse to the map $\gamma \mapsto W$ is given by $\gamma_t(x) := \omega(1,t,x)$.[33] First we show that $\gamma_{\epsilon t}(x) = \omega(\epsilon,t,x)$, where ω corresponds to W obtained by (12.1) from γ. Indeed, consider,

$$\frac{d}{d\epsilon}\bigg|_{\epsilon=\epsilon_0} \gamma_{\epsilon t}(x) = \frac{d}{d\epsilon}\bigg|_{\epsilon=1} \frac{1}{\epsilon_0}\gamma_{\epsilon(\epsilon_0 t)}(x) = \frac{1}{\epsilon_0} W(\epsilon_0 t, \gamma_{\epsilon_0 t}(x)),$$

where in the last equality, we used the definition of W. Thus $\gamma_{\epsilon t}(x)$ satisfies the ODE (12.2). Hence, $\gamma_t(x) = \omega(1,t,x)$, and we may, therefore, reconstruct γ, given W. We therefore have constructed a left inverse to the map $\gamma \mapsto W$.

Now we must show that if W is as in the statement of the proposition, and if we let ω be the solution to the ODE (12.2), then,

$$\frac{d}{d\epsilon}\bigg|_{\epsilon=1} \omega(1,\epsilon t,x) = W(t,\omega(1,t,x)). \tag{12.3}$$

I.e., we must show our left inverse is also a right inverse. (12.3) will follow from (12.2) if we can show, $\omega(1,\epsilon t,x) = \omega(\epsilon,t,x)$. This, in turn, will follow if we can show for every ϵ_0, $\omega(\epsilon_0\epsilon,t,x) = \omega(\epsilon,\epsilon_0 t,x)$. We already know that $\omega(\epsilon,\epsilon_0 t,x)$ satisfies the ODE (12.2) with t replaced by $\epsilon_0 t$. Thus, we need only show the same is true for $\omega(\epsilon_0\epsilon,t,x)$. However,

$$\frac{d}{d\epsilon}\omega(\epsilon\epsilon_0,t,x) = \epsilon_0\frac{1}{\epsilon\epsilon_0} W(\epsilon\epsilon_0 t, \omega(\epsilon\epsilon_0,t,x)) = \frac{1}{\epsilon} W(\epsilon\epsilon_0 t, \omega(\epsilon\epsilon_0,t,x)).$$

Since $\omega(0\epsilon_0,t,x) = x$, by definition, this completes the proof. □

The correspondence between γ and W given by the proof of Proposition 12.1 will be an essential point in what follows.

Now we turn back to the perspective used in Section 11: fixing δ and x_0 and working with $(\delta X, \sum d)$ near x_0. Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be open, and let $\Omega' \Subset \Omega'' \Subset \Omega$ be open, relatively compact, subsets of Ω. We assume we are given a list of C^∞ vector fields with single-parameter formal degrees $\left(Z,\tilde{d}\right) = \left(Z_1,\tilde{d}_1\right),\ldots,\left(Z_q,\tilde{d}_q\right)$, $\tilde{d}_j \in (0,\infty)$. We fix $x_0 \in \Omega'$ and assume that $\left(Z,\tilde{d}\right)$ satisfies all of the assumptions of the vector fields and formal degrees of the same name in Section 11 (and therefore we are given some $1 \geq \xi > 0$). We also assume that we are given a C^∞ function

$$\widehat{\gamma}(t,x) : B^N(\rho) \times \Omega'' \to \Omega,$$

---

[32] It is easy to see that the solution is unique, using that $W(0)=0$, W is smooth, and the integral form of Gronwall's inequality.

[33] It is easy to see, via the contraction mapping principle, using the fact that $W(0)=0$ and $W(t)$ is smooth, that the solution of (12.2) exists up to $\epsilon=1$ for t sufficiently small.

where $\rho > 0$ is some fixed positive number, and $\widehat{\gamma}(0,x) \equiv x$. Here $\rho > 0$ is small enough that for $t \in B^N(\rho)$, $\widehat{\gamma}_t^{-1}$ exists.

For the primary example where we will apply the results from this section, take the same setup as in Section 10. Let $j,k \in -\log_2 \mathcal{A}$ and set $j_0 = j \wedge k$. We will take $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right) = \left(2^{-j_0}X, \sum d\right)$ and $\widehat{\gamma}_t = \gamma_{2^{-j_0}t}$. It is essential that all of the constants in this section can be chosen to be independent of $x_0 \in K_0$ and $j,k \in -\log_2 \mathcal{A}$. Note that our assumption on the list (X,d) in Section 6 implies that $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right) = \left(2^{-j_0}X, \sum d\right)$ satisfies all of the assumptions of Section 11 uniformly in the above parameters. Thus, m-admissible constants (as defined in Section 11) can be chosen to be independent of the above parameters. In particular, the results of Theorem 11.1 hold uniformly in the above parameters.

We let $n_0, \eta_1, \xi_1 > 0$, and $\Phi : B^{n_0}(\eta_1) \to B_{\left(Z,\tilde{d}\right)}(x_0,\xi)$ be as in Theorem 11.1. Furthermore, we let $Y_1, \ldots, Y_q$ be the pullbacks of $Z_1, \ldots, Z_q$ as in Theorem 11.1. In order to work with our assumption that (X,d) controls γ_t (see Definition 6.3), we introduce the following two conditions on $\widehat{\gamma}_t$, which will turn out to be equivalent. All parameters that follow are assumed to be strictly positive real numbers:

1. $\mathcal{Q}_1\left(\rho_1, \tau_1, \{\sigma_1^m\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}\right)$ ($\rho_1 \leq \rho$, $\tau_1 \leq \xi_1$): For $x \in \Omega'$, define the vector field,

$$\widehat{W}(t,x) = \frac{d}{d\epsilon}\bigg|_{\epsilon=1} \widehat{\gamma}_{\epsilon t} \circ \widehat{\gamma}_t^{-1}(x). \tag{12.4}$$

   We suppose,

   - $\widehat{W}(t,x) = \sum_{l=1}^q c_l(t,x) Z_l(x)$, on $B_{\left(Z,\tilde{d}\right)}(x_0,\tau_1)$,
   - $\sum_{|\alpha|+|\beta|\leq m} \left\| Z^\alpha \partial_t^\beta c_l \right\|_{C^0\left(B^N(\rho_1) \times B_{\left(Z,\tilde{d}\right)}(x_0,\tau_1)\right)} \leq \sigma_1^m$.
   - Note that we may, without loss of generality, assume that $c_l(0,x) \equiv 0$, as we may replace $c_l(t,x)$ with $c_l(t,x) - c_l(0,x)$ for every l by using the fact that $\widehat{W}(0,x) \equiv 0$.

2. $\mathcal{Q}_2\left(\rho_2, \tau_2, \{\sigma_2^m\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}\right)$:

   - $\widehat{\gamma}\left(B^N(\rho_2) \times B_{\left(Z,\tilde{d}\right)}(x_0,\tau_2)\right) \subseteq B_{\left(Z,\tilde{d}\right)}(x_0,\xi_1)$,
   - If $\eta' = \eta'(\tau_2) > 0$ is a 2-admissible constant so small[34] that,

$$\Phi\left(B^{n_0}(\eta')\right) \subseteq B_{\left(Z,\tilde{d}\right)}(x_0,\tau_2) \subseteq \Phi\left(B^{n_0}(\eta_1)\right),$$

     then if we define a new map,

$$\theta_t(u) = \Phi^{-1} \circ \gamma_t \circ \Phi(u) : B^N(\rho_2) \times B^{n_0}(\eta') \to B^{n_0}(\eta_1),$$

     we have,

$$\|\theta\|_{C^m\left(B^N(\rho_2)\times B^{n_0}(\eta')\right)} \leq \sigma_2^m.$$

Remark 12.2. The particular parameters in $\mathcal{Q}_1$ and $\mathcal{Q}_2$ are not important. All that is important is that, in our primary application, they may be chosen independent of j,k and x_0. At times we will keep track of the parameters to make clear the interdependence between the various constants, but the reader may wish to ignore these details on a first reading.

Proposition 12.3. *$\mathcal{Q}_1 \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{Q}_2$ in the following sense:*

- $\mathcal{Q}_1\left(\rho_1, \tau_1, \{\sigma_1^m\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}\right) \Rightarrow$ *there exists a 2-admissible constant* $\rho_2 = \rho_2\left(\rho_1, \tau_1, \sigma_1^1, N\right)$*, and* $m+1$*-admissible constants* $\sigma_2^m = \sigma_2^m\left(\sigma_1^{m+1}, N\right)$ *such that* $\mathcal{Q}_2\left(\rho_2, \frac{\tau_1}{2}, \{\sigma_2^m\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}\right)$ *holds.*
- $\mathcal{Q}_2\left(\rho_2, \tau_2, \{\sigma_2^m\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}\right) \Rightarrow$ *there exists a 2-admissible constant* $\tau_1 = \tau_1(\tau_2) > 0$ *and* m*-admissible constants* $\sigma_1^m = \sigma_1^m\left(\sigma_2^{m+1}, N\right)$*, such that* $\mathcal{Q}_1\left(\rho_2, \tau_1, \{\sigma_1^m\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}\right)$ *holds.*

---

[34] Such an η' exists by Proposition 11.2.

Proof. Suppose $\mathcal{Q}_1\left(\rho_1, \tau_1, \{\sigma_1^m\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}\right)$ holds. Fix $\rho_2 > 0$ small, to be chosen in a moment. Suppose

$$z \in \widehat{\gamma}\left(B^N(\rho_2) \times B_{\left(Z,\tilde{d}\right)}\left(x_0, \frac{\tau_1}{2}\right)\right);$$

and so there exists $t_0 \in B^N(\rho_2)$ and $y \in B_{\left(Z,\tilde{d}\right)}\left(x_0, \frac{\tau_1}{2}\right)$ such that $z = \widehat{\gamma}_{t_0}(y)$. We wish to show that $z \in B_{\left(Z,\tilde{d}\right)}(x_0, \xi_1)$ (by appropriately choosing ρ_2). To do so, it suffices to show $z \in B_{\left(Z,\tilde{d}\right)}\left(y, \frac{\tau_1}{2}\right)$, as then we would have $z \in B_{\left(Z,\tilde{d}\right)}(x_0, \tau_1) \subseteq B_{\left(Z,\tilde{d}\right)}(x_0, \xi_1)$. Define a curve $\kappa : [0,1] \to \Omega$ by

$$\kappa(s) = \widehat{\gamma}_{st_0}(y).$$

Note that $\kappa(0) = y$ and $\kappa(1) = z$. Also,

$$\frac{d}{ds}\kappa(s) = \frac{1}{s}W(st_0, \kappa(s)) = \sum_{l=1}^{q} \frac{1}{s} c_l(st_0, \kappa(s)) Z_l(\kappa(s)).$$

Since[35] $c_l(st_0, \kappa(s))\big|_{s=0} = 0$, the mean value theorem shows that, for $0 < s < 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|\frac{1}{s}c_l(st_0, \kappa(s))\right| &\leq \sup_{0\leq s\leq 1}\left|\frac{d}{ds}c_l(st_0, \kappa(s))\right| \\
&\leq \sup_{0\leq s\leq 1}\left[\left|t_0 \cdot \bigtriangledown_t c_l(st_0, \kappa(s))\right| + \sum_{l=1}^{q}\left|\left(\frac{1}{s}c_l(st_0) Z_l c_l\right)(st_0, \kappa(s))\right|\right] \\
&\lesssim |t_0|\left(\sigma_1^1 + \left(\sigma_1^1\right)^2\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $\left|\frac{1}{s}c_l(st_0, \cdot)\right| \leq \sigma_1^1$, and in the last line, we are thinking of $c_l(st_0) Z_l c_l$ as the vector field $c_l(st_0, \cdot) Z_l(\cdot)$ acting on the function $c_l(st_0, \cdot)$.

Thus, $\frac{d}{ds}\kappa(s) = \sum_{l=1}^{q} a_l(s) Z_l(\kappa(s))$, where $|a_l| \lesssim |t_0|$. By taking $|t_0|$ sufficiently small (i.e., by taking ρ_2 sufficiently small), we may insure that $z = \kappa(1) \in B_{\left(Z,\tilde{d}\right)}\left(y, \frac{\tau_1}{2}\right)$.

Hence, it makes since to define $\eta' > 0$ and θ_t as in the definition of $\mathcal{Q}_2$. It follows directly from the definition of θ that $\theta_0(u) \equiv u$. Furthermore, pulling back (12.4) via the map Φ shows that,

$$\frac{d}{d\epsilon}\bigg|_{\epsilon=0} \theta_{\epsilon t} \circ \theta_t^{-1}(u) = \widetilde{W}(t, u), \tag{12.5}$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{W}(t, u) &= \sum_{l=1}^{q} \widetilde{c_l}(t, u) Y_l(u), \\
\widetilde{c_l}(t, u) &= c_l(t, \Phi(u)).
\end{aligned}$$

We claim,

$$\left\|\widetilde{W}\right\|_{C^m(B^N(\rho_2)\times B^{n_0}(\eta'))} \leq C_m, \tag{12.6}$$

where $C_m = C_m(\sigma_1^m)$ is an m-admissible constant. Indeed, we already have the result for Y_l by (11.1). Hence it suffices to bound the C^m norm of $\widetilde{c_l}$. However, applying (a slight modification of) (11.2),[36]

$$\left\|\widetilde{c_l}\right\|_{C^m(B^N(\rho_2)\times B^{n_0}(\eta'))} \approx_{m-1} \sum_{|\alpha|+|\beta|\leq m} \left\|Y^\alpha \partial_t^\beta \widetilde{c_l}\right\|_{C^0(B^N(\rho_2)\times B^{n_0}(\eta'))}. \tag{12.7}$$

Note that,

$$Y^\alpha \partial_t^\beta \widetilde{c_l}(t, u) = \left(Z^\alpha \partial_t^\beta c_l\right)(t, \Phi(u)).$$

---

[35] As remarked above, we may assume $c_l(0, x) \equiv 0$.

[36] This slight modification can be proved easily by combining (11.1) and (11.3).

Combining this with the fact that,

$$B^N(\rho_2) \times \Phi(B^{n_0}(\eta')) \subseteq B^N(\rho_1) \times B_{(Z,\tilde{d})}(x_0,\tau_1),$$

we have from (12.7),

$$\|\widetilde{c}_l\|_{C^m(B^N(\rho_2)\times B^{n_0}(\eta'))} \lesssim_{m-1} \sum_{|\alpha|+|\beta|\leq m} \left\|Z^\alpha \partial_t^\beta c_l\right\|_{C^0\left(B^N(\rho_1)\times B_{(Z,\tilde{d})}(x_0,\tau_1)\right)} \leq \sigma_1^m,$$

completing the proof of (12.6).

To complete the proof of $\mathcal{Q}_1 \Rightarrow \mathcal{Q}_2$, we bound the C^m norm of θ. For $t \in B^N(\rho_2)$, $u \in B^{n_0}(\eta')$, and $\epsilon \in [0,1]$, define a function,

$$\omega(\epsilon,t,u) = \theta(\epsilon t,u).$$

In light of (12.5), ω satisfies the ODE in the ϵ variable:

$$\frac{d}{d\epsilon}\omega(\epsilon,t,u) = \frac{1}{\epsilon}\widetilde{W}(\epsilon t,\omega(\epsilon,t,u)), \quad \omega(0,t,u) = u.$$

Using that $\widetilde{W}(0,u) = 0$ and that $\widetilde{W}$ is smooth, standard theorems for ODEs show that there exists $\sigma_2^m = \sigma_2^m(C_{m+1},m,N)$ such that,

$$\|\omega\|_{C^m([0,1]\times B^N(\rho_2)\times B^{n_0}(\eta'))} \leq \sigma_2^m.$$

Since $\theta(t,u) = \omega(1,t,u)$, this completes the proof of $\mathcal{Q}_1 \Rightarrow \mathcal{Q}_2$.

Suppose that $\mathcal{Q}_2\left(\rho_2,\tau_2,\{\sigma_2^m\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}\right)$ holds. Define,

$$\widetilde{W}(t,u) = \left.\frac{d}{d\epsilon}\right|_{\epsilon=1} \theta_{\epsilon t}\circ\theta_t^{-1}(u).$$

Then,

$$\left\|\widetilde{W}\right\|_{C^m(B^N(\rho_2)\times B^{n_0}(\eta'))} \leq C_m \sigma_2^{m+1},$$

where C_m depends only on m. Using (11.1) and (11.3), we see that,

$$\widetilde{W}(t,u) = \sum_{l=1}^q \widetilde{c}_l(t,u)\, Y_l(u), \tag{12.8}$$

and,

$$\|\widetilde{c}_l\|_{C^m(B^N(\rho_2)\times B^{n_0}(\eta'))} \leq C'_m,$$

where $C'_m = C'_m\left(\sigma_2^{m+1}\right)$ is an m-admissible constant. Applying, again a slight modification of, (11.2), we have,

$$\sum_{|\alpha|+|\beta|\leq m} \left\|Y^\alpha \partial_t^\beta \widetilde{c}_l\right\|_{C^0(B^N(\rho_2)\times B^{n_0}(\eta'))} \approx_{m-1} \|\widetilde{c}_l\|_{C^m(B^N(\rho_2)\times B^{n_0}(\eta'))} \leq C'_m. \tag{12.9}$$

Using Proposition 11.2, let $\tau_1 = \tau_1(\eta') > 0$ be a 2-admissible constant such that,

$$B_{(Z,\tilde{d})}(x_0,\tau_1) \subseteq \Phi(B^{n_0}(\eta')).$$

Pushing (12.8) and (12.9) forward via the map Φ, and taking $\widehat{W}$ as in the definition of $\mathcal{Q}_1$, we see for $x \in \Phi(B^{n_0}(\eta'))$ and $c_l(t,x) = \widetilde{c}_l\left(t,\Phi^{-1}(x)\right)$,

$$\widehat{W}(t,x) = \sum_{l=1}^q c_l(t,x)\, Z_l(x),$$

$$\sum_{|\alpha|+|\beta|\leq m} \left\|Z^\alpha \partial_t^\beta c_l\right\|_{C^0\left(B^N(\rho_2)\times B_{(Z,\tilde{d})}(x_0,\tau_1)\right)} \lesssim_{m-1} C'_m,$$

completing the proof. $\square$

Definition 12.4. We say $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right)$ controls $\widehat{\gamma}$ at the unit scale if either of the equivalent conditions $\mathcal{Q}_1$ or $\mathcal{Q}_2$ holds (for some choice of the parameters). If we wish to make the point x_0 explicit, we will say $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right)$ controls $\widehat{\gamma}$ at the unit scale near x_0.

Proposition 12.5. *Let (X, d) and γ be as in Section 6. (X, d) controls γ if and only if $(\delta X, \sum d)$ controls $\gamma_{\delta t}$ at the unit scale near x_0 for every $\delta \in \mathcal{A}$ and $x_0 \in K_0$, and the parameters of $\mathcal{Q}_1$ (equivalently $\mathcal{Q}_2$) can be chosen independent of $x_0 \in K_0$ and $\delta \in \mathcal{A}$.*

Proof. Let $\delta \in \mathcal{A}$ and $x_0 \in K_0$. Define $\widehat{\gamma}_t = \gamma_{\delta t}$. Note that if $W(t, x)$ is as in Definition 6.3 and if $\widehat{W}(t, x)$ is as in $\mathcal{Q}_1$, then,

$$\widehat{W}(t, x) = W(\delta t, x).$$

Now the result follows just by comparing $\mathcal{Q}_1$ and Definition 6.2. $\square$

In light of Proposition 12.5, to work with our assumption that (X, d) controls γ, we may instead work "at the unit scale." For the rest of this section we work in this perspective, with the understanding that Proposition 12.5 allows us to transfer our results from the "unit scale" to "every scale."

Proposition 12.6. *If $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right)$ controls $\widehat{\gamma}^1_{t_1}$ and $\widehat{\gamma}^2_{t_2}$ at the unit scale, then $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right)$ controls $\widehat{\gamma}^1_{t_1} \circ \widehat{\gamma}^2_{t_2}$ at the unit scale. If $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right)$ controls $\widehat{\gamma}_t$ at the unit scale, then $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right)$ controls $\widehat{\gamma}_t^{-1}$ at the unit scale.*

Proof. Both of the above statements are more easily verified using $\mathcal{Q}_2$. Indeed, the C^m norm of,

$$\Phi^{-1} \circ \widehat{\gamma}^1_{t_1} \circ \widehat{\gamma}^2_{t_2} \circ \Phi = \left(\Phi^{-1} \circ \widehat{\gamma}^1_{t_1} \circ \Phi\right) \circ \left(\Phi^{-1} \circ \widehat{\gamma}^2_{t_2} \circ \Phi\right)$$

can clearly be bounded in terms of the C^m norms of,

$$\Phi^{-1} \circ \widehat{\gamma}^1_{t_1} \circ \Phi \text{ and } \Phi^{-1} \circ \widehat{\gamma}^2_{t_2} \circ \Phi,$$

provided one shrinks the parameters ρ_2 and τ_2 appropriately (so that the composition is defined). A similar proof works for $\widehat{\gamma}_t^{-1}$. We leave further details to the interested reader. $\square$

Proposition 12.7. *If (Z, d) controls $\widehat{\gamma}_t$ at the unit scale, and $c = (c_1, \ldots, c_N) \in [0, 1]^N$ is a constant, then $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right)$ controls,*

$$\widehat{\gamma}^c((t_1, \ldots, t_N), x) := \widehat{\gamma}((c_1 t_1, \ldots, c_N t_N), x),$$

at the unit scale. Moreover, the parameters in the definition of control at the unit scale may be chosen independent of c.

Proof. This is obvious from the definition of control (using either $\mathcal{Q}_1$ or $\mathcal{Q}_2$). $\square$

So far in this section, we have covered the necessary technical details to deal with our assumption that (X, d) controls γ. The other part of our assumption was that the vector fields with formal degrees (X_j, d_j) were generated by vector fields with formal degrees of the form $(X_\alpha, \deg(\alpha))$, where $t^\alpha X_\alpha$ was a term in the Taylor series of $W(t, x)$, when taken in the t variable, and $\deg(\alpha)$ was nonzero in only one component. We now turn to the various definitions and theorems necessary to deal with this assumption. Again, we work at the unit scale. We continue to take $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right)$, $\widehat{\gamma}_t(x)$, and x_0 as above. We assume, throughout the rest of the section, that $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right)$ controls $\widehat{\gamma}$ at the unit scale (near x_0).

Definition 12.8. Let $\{Z_1, \ldots, Z_r\}$ be a subset of $\{Z_1, \ldots, Z_q\}$. For $M \in \mathbb{N}$, we say $Z_1, \ldots, Z_r$ M-generates $Z_1, \ldots, Z_q$ if each Z_j $(r + 1 \leq j \leq q)$ can be written in the form,

$$Z_j = \operatorname{ad}(Z_{l_1}) \operatorname{ad}(Z_{l_2}) \cdots \operatorname{ad}(Z_{l_m}) Z_{l_{m+1}}, \quad 0 \leq m \leq M - 1, \quad l \leq l_k \leq r.$$

Define $\widehat{W}(t,x)$ as the vector field,

$$\widehat{W}(t,x) = \frac{d}{d\epsilon}\bigg|_{\epsilon=1} \widehat{\gamma}_{\epsilon t} \circ \widehat{\gamma}_t^{-1}(x).$$

Let $Z_\alpha(x)$ be the Taylor coefficients of $W(t,x)$ when the Taylor series is taken in the t variable:

$$\widehat{W}(t,x) \sim \sum_{|\alpha|>0} t^\alpha Z_\alpha(x).$$

Definition 12.9. For $M_1, M_2 \in \mathbb{N}$, we say $\widehat{\gamma}$ M_1, M_2 generates $Z_1, \ldots, Z_q$ if there is a subset $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \{Z_\alpha : |\alpha| \leq M_1\} \cap \{Z_1, \ldots, Z_q\}$, such that $\mathcal{F}$ M_2-generates $Z_1, \ldots, Z_q$.

Since we are assuming that $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right)$ controls $\widehat{\gamma}$ at the unit scale, we may pull $\widehat{\gamma}$ back under the map Φ as in $\mathcal{Q}_2$ to obtain the C^∞ map:

$$\theta_t(u) = \Phi^{-1} \circ \widehat{\gamma}_t \circ \Phi(u) : B^N(\rho_2) \times B^{n_0}(\eta') \to B^{n_0}(\eta),$$

as in $\mathcal{Q}_2$. As usual, define $Y_1, \ldots Y_q$ to be the pullbacks of $Z_1, \ldots, Z_q$ under the map Φ. Define,

$$\widetilde{W}(t,u) = \frac{d}{d\epsilon}\bigg|_{\epsilon=1} \theta_{\epsilon t} \circ \theta_t^{-1}(u).$$

Let $Y_\alpha(u)$ be the Taylor coefficients of $\widetilde{W}$ expressed as a Taylor series in the t-variable:

$$\widetilde{W}(t,u) \sim \sum_{|\alpha|>0} t^\alpha Y_\alpha.$$

It is immediate to verify that Y_α is the pullback of Z_α under the map Φ.

Theorem 12.10. *Suppose $\widehat{\gamma}$ M_1, M_2 generates $Z_1, \ldots, Z_q$. Then, the set of vector fields*

$$\{Y_\alpha : |\alpha| \leq M_1\}, \tag{12.10}$$

satisfies Hörmander's conditions of order M_2 on $B^{n_0}(\eta')$. More specifically, if we let $V_1, \ldots V_L$ denote those vector fields in (12.10) *along with all commutators of those vector fields in* (12.10) *up to order M_2, then,*

$$\left| \det_{n_0 \times n_0} V(u) \right|_\infty \gtrsim_2 1, \quad \forall u \in B^{n_0}(\eta'),$$

where we have written V to denote the matrix whose columns are $V_1, \ldots, V_L$. In short, θ satisfies $(\mathcal{C}_Z)$.

Proof. By assumption a subset of $\{Z_\alpha : |\alpha| \leq M_1\}$ M_2-generates $Z_1, \ldots, Z_q$. Pulling this back under Φ we see that a subset of (12.10) M_2-generates $Y_1, \ldots Y_q$. I.e., each of $Y_1, \ldots Y_q$ appears in the list $V_1, \ldots V_L$. Thus,

$$\left| \det_{n_0 \times n_0} V(u) \right|_\infty \geq \left| \det_{n_0 \times n_0} Y(u) \right|_\infty \gtrsim_2 1, \quad \forall u \in B^{n_0}(\eta').$$

In the last inequality, we have used (11.3). $\square$

We now combine the above discussion to obtain the main results of this section.

Theorem 12.11. *Suppose $Z_1, \ldots, Z_r$ M_2-generates $Z_1, \ldots, Z_q$. Let $\widehat{\gamma}^l(t,x) : B^N(\rho) \times \Omega'' \to \Omega$, $l = 1, \ldots, k$, be a sequence of k C^∞ functions, such that each $\widehat{\gamma}^l$ is controlled at the unit scale by $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right)$. Let*

$$\widehat{W}_j(t,x) = \frac{d}{d\epsilon}\bigg|_{\epsilon=1} \widehat{\gamma}^j_{\epsilon t} \circ \left(\widehat{\gamma}^j_t\right)^{-1}(x),$$

and define the vector fields $V_{j,\alpha}$ *to be the Taylor coefficients (in* t*) of* $\widehat{W}_j$*:*

$$\widehat{W}_j\left(t\right) \sim \sum_{\alpha} t^\alpha V_{j,\alpha}.$$

Suppose there is $M_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ *such that each* Z_s $(1 \leq s \leq r)$ *appears as some* $V_{j,\alpha}$ *for* $|\alpha| \leq M_1$*. Define,*

$$\widehat{\gamma}_{(t_1,\ldots,t_k)}\left(x\right) = \widehat{\gamma}^1_{t_1} \circ \widehat{\gamma}^2_{t_2} \circ \cdots \circ \widehat{\gamma}^k_{t_k}\left(x\right).$$

Then, $\widehat{\gamma}$ *is controlled at the unit scale by* $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right)$*. Moreover if we take* θ *as in* $\mathcal{Q}_2$*, then* θ *satisfies* $(\mathcal{C}_Z)$*, where the constants in the definition of* $(\mathcal{C}_Z)$ *are* 2*-admissible constants depending on the above parameters (*M_1*,* M_2*).*

Corollary 12.12. *Take the same setup as Theorem 12.11; and, more precisely, assume each* $\widehat{\gamma}^l$ *satisfies* $\mathcal{Q}_2\left(\rho_2, \tau_2, \{\sigma_2^m\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}\right)$*. Then,* θ *satisfies* $(\mathcal{C}_J)$ *(at* 0*), where the constants in the definition of* $(\mathcal{C}_J)$ *are* 2*-admissible constants depending on the above parameters (*M_1*,* M_2*,* k*,* ρ_2*,* τ_2*,* $\{\sigma_2^m\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$*).*

Proof of Corollary 12.12 given Theorem 12.11. Letting $\widehat{\gamma}^1, \ldots, \widehat{\gamma}^k$ vary over all choices satisfying the hypotheses of Corollary 12.12 (for a fixed choice of the parameters), Theorem 12.11 shows that the set of all such θ, so obtained, satisfies $(\mathcal{C}_Z^u)$. Since $\{\sigma_2^m\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ is fixed, the set of all such θ forms a bounded subset of C^∞. The corollary now follows by applying Theorem 9.4 which states that $(\mathcal{C}_Z^u) \Rightarrow (\mathcal{C}_J^u)$ for bounded subsets of C^∞. ☐

Proof of Theorem 12.11. That $\widehat{\gamma}$ is controlled at the unit scale by $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right)$ follows from Proposition 12.6. Define,

$$\widehat{W}\left(t\right) = \frac{d}{d\epsilon}\bigg|_{\epsilon=1} \widehat{\gamma}_{\epsilon t} \circ \widehat{\gamma}_t^{-1} \sim \sum_{|\alpha|>0} t^\alpha Z_\alpha.$$

In light of Theorem 12.10, we need only show that each $Z_1, \ldots, Z_r$ appears as some Z_α with $|\alpha| \leq M_1$. Since,

$$\widehat{\gamma}_{(t_1,\ldots,t_k)} = \widehat{\gamma}^1_{t_1} \circ \widehat{\gamma}^2_{t_2} \circ \cdots \circ \widehat{\gamma}^k_{t_k},$$

it is easy to see that,

$$\widehat{W}\left(0, \cdots, 0, t_j, 0, \cdots 0, x\right) = \widehat{W}_j\left(t_j, x\right).$$

Since each $Z_1, \ldots, Z_r$ appears as a Taylor coefficient of some $\widehat{W}_j$ (with $|\alpha| \leq M_1$), the same is true for $\widehat{W}$. This completes the proof. ☐

Though we will work in slightly greater generality in the sequel, it is worthwhile to take a moment and see the main consequence of our assumptions on γ in Theorem 7.2, in light of Corollary 12.12.

Proposition 12.13. *Let* (X, d) *and* γ *be as in Theorem 7.2; i.e.,* (X, d) *and* γ *satisfy all of the assumptions of Section 6. Fix* $x_0 \in K_0$ *and* $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in \mathcal{A}$*. Let* $\delta_0 = \delta_1 \vee \delta_2$ *(*$\delta_0 \in \mathcal{A}$ *by our assumption on* $\mathcal{A}$*). Define,* $\widehat{\gamma}$ *as either,*

$$\widehat{\gamma}_{(t_1,t_2,t_3,t_4)}\left(x\right) = \gamma^{-1}_{\delta_1 t_4} \circ \gamma_{\delta_2 t_3} \circ \gamma^{-1}_{\delta_2 t_2} \circ \gamma_{\delta_1 t_1}\left(x\right), \tag{12.11}$$

or,

$$\widehat{\gamma}_{(t_1,t_2,t_3,t_4)}\left(x\right) = \gamma_{\delta_1 t_4} \circ \gamma^{-1}_{\delta_2 t_3} \circ \gamma_{\delta_2 t_2} \circ \gamma^{-1}_{\delta_1 t_1}\left(x\right). \tag{12.12}$$

Then, $(\delta_0 X, \sum d)$ *controls* $\widehat{\gamma}$ *at the unit scale near* x_0 *(and the parameters in the definition of control may be chosen independent of* δ_1*,* δ_2*, and* x_0*). Moreover, if we define* $\theta_t\left(u\right)$ *as in* $\mathcal{Q}_2$*, then* θ *satisfies* $(\mathcal{C}_J)$ *(at* 0*) uniformly in* δ_1*,* δ_2*, and* x_0*. More specifically, if we let* $\mathcal{S}$ *be the set of all such* θ *(as* δ_1*,* δ_2*, and* x_0 *vary) then* $\mathcal{S}$ *satisfies* $(\mathcal{C}_J^u)$*.*

Proof. Let $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right) = (\delta_0 X, \sum d)$. By Proposition 12.5, $\gamma_{\delta_0 t}$ is controlled at the unit scale by (Z, d). Proposition 12.7 then shows that $\gamma_{\delta_1 t}$ and $\gamma_{\delta_2 t}$ are controlled by $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right)$ at the unit scale. Proposition 12.6 applies to show that $\gamma_{\delta_1 t}^{-1}$, $\gamma_{\delta_2 t}^{-1}$, and $\widehat{\gamma}$ are all controlled at the unit scale by $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right)$ (uniformly in the relevant parameters). The proof will then be completed by combining Corollary 12.12 with the following lemma.

Lemma 12.14. *Taking the same setup as in Proposition 12.13, and letting* $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right) = (\delta_0 X, \sum d)$. *There is a subset* $Z_1, \ldots, Z_r$ *of* $Z_1, \ldots, Z_q$ *such that* $Z_1, \ldots, Z_r$ M_2*-generates* $Z_1, \ldots, Z_q$. *Moreover, each* $Z_1, \ldots, Z_r$ *appears as a Taylor coefficient (in* t*) of either*

$$\widehat{W}_{\delta_1}(t, x) = \frac{d}{d\epsilon}\bigg|_{\epsilon=1} \gamma_{\delta_1(\epsilon t)} \circ \gamma_{\delta_1 t}^{-1}(x) \text{ or } \widehat{W}_{\delta_2}(t, x) = \frac{d}{d\epsilon}\bigg|_{\epsilon=1} \gamma_{\delta_2(\epsilon t)} \circ \gamma_{\delta_2 t}^{-1}(x),$$

and this Taylor coefficient may be chosen to be the coefficient of t^α*, where* $|\alpha| \leq M_1$. *Here,* $M_1, M_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ *may be chosen independent of* δ_1*,* δ_2*, and* x_0.

Proof. First we recall the definition of (X, d). We wrote,

$$W(t, x) = \frac{d}{d\epsilon}\bigg|_{\epsilon=1} \gamma_{\epsilon t}^{-1} \circ \gamma_t(x) \sim \sum_{|\alpha|>0} t^\alpha X_\alpha.$$

We took a finite subset of

$$\{(X_\alpha, \deg(\alpha)) : \deg(\alpha) \text{ is nonzero in only one component}\},$$

denote this finite set by $(X_1, d_1), \ldots, (X_r, d_r)$, and assume each $(X_1, d_1), \ldots, (X_r, d_r)$ appears as $(X_\alpha, \deg(\alpha))$ for some $|\alpha| \leq M_1$. Take $Z_1, \ldots, Z_r$ to be $\delta_0^{d_1} X_1, \ldots, \delta_0^{d_r} X_r$.

We assumed that $(X_1, d_1), \ldots, (X_r, d_r)$ generates the finite list $(X_1, d_1), \ldots, (X_q, d_q)$. That is, each (X_j, d_j) can be written in the form,

$$\begin{aligned} X_j &= \operatorname{ad}(X_{l_1}) \operatorname{ad}(X_{l_2}) \cdots \operatorname{ad}\left(X_{l_{m-1}}\right) X_{l_m}, \\ d_j &= d_{l_1} + d_{l_1} + \cdots + d_{l_m}, \end{aligned} \tag{12.13}$$

where $1 \leq l_k \leq r$ for each k, for some $1 \leq m = m(j)$. We choose $M_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $m \leq M_2$ for every j. Note that if we take $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right) = (\delta_0 X, \sum d)$ then (12.13) shows,

$$Z_j = \operatorname{ad}(Z_{l_1}) \operatorname{ad}(Z_{l_2}) \cdots \operatorname{ad}\left(Z_{l_{m-1}}\right) Z_{l_m},$$

for the same choice of $l_1, \ldots, l_m$. Hence, $Z_1, \ldots, Z_r$ M_2-generates $Z_1, \ldots, Z_q$.

To complete the proof, we must show that each Z_j $(1 \leq j \leq r)$ appears as a Taylor coefficient of either W_{δ_1} or W_{δ_2}. Fix j $(1 \leq j \leq r)$, and suppose that d_j is nonzero in only the μ component (by assumption we know it is nonzero in only one component). Since $\delta_0 = \delta_1 \vee \delta_2$, $\delta_0^\mu \in \{\delta_1^\mu, \delta_2^\mu\}$. We suppose that $\delta_0^\mu = \delta_1^\mu$, the other case is similar. We will show Z_j is a Taylor coefficient of W_{δ_1}. Indeed,

$$W_{\delta_1}(t, x) = W(\delta_1 t, x) \sim \sum_{|\alpha|>0} t^\alpha \delta_1^{\deg(\alpha)} X_\alpha.$$

Take $|\alpha| \leq M_1$ such that $(X_j, d_j) = (X_\alpha, \deg(\alpha))$. Since d_j is nonzero in only the μ component, we have,

$$\delta_1^{\deg(\alpha)} X_\alpha = \delta_1^{d_j} X_j = \delta_0^{d_j} X_j = Z_j,$$

completing the proof. □

Remark 12.15. Lemma 12.14 is the only place where we use that $(X_1, d_1), \ldots, (X_r, d_r)$ were chosen with each d_j nonzero in only one component; i.e., that (X, d) was generated by "pure-powers." Note, though, that this is essential to Lemma 12.14.

12.1 Multi-parameter curvature conditions

Throughout the paper, we work mostly with the curvature conditions $(\mathcal{C}_Z)$ and $(\mathcal{C}_J)$. Indeed, using the notation in Proposition 12.13, the essence of Section 12 was that θ satisfies $(\mathcal{C}_J)$ uniformly in any relevant parameters (and this followed by showing that it satisfied $(\mathcal{C}_Z)$ uniformly in any relevant parameters). While $(\mathcal{C}_Z)$ seems to be the best suited to theoretical applications, $(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}})$ is perhaps more intuitive. The reader may, therefore, wonder if there is an analog to Theorem 9.1 in our setup. Indeed, there is, and this section is devoted to discussing this fact. The results in this section will not be used in the sequel (except briefly in Section 12.3), and the reader may safely skip this section on a first reading.

The following curvature conditions, we think of as being "scale invariant." We, therefore, denote them by $\left(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^s\right)$, $(\mathcal{C}_Y^s)$, and $(\mathcal{C}_Z^s)$ (we discuss $(\mathcal{C}_J)$ in Remark 12.17). The condition $(\mathcal{C}_Z^s)$ is precisely the condition assumed on γ in Section 6. We restate it here. In what follows, $\gamma(t,x) : B^N(\rho) \times \Omega'' \to \Omega$ is a C^∞ function with $\gamma(0,x) \equiv x$, where Ω'' and Ω are as in Section 6.

- $(\mathcal{C}_Z^s)$: Define,
$$W(t) = \frac{d}{d\epsilon}\bigg|_{\epsilon=1} \gamma_{\epsilon t} \circ \gamma_t^{-1}(x).$$
Write $W(t) \sim \sum_\alpha t^\alpha X_\alpha$, and define
$$\mathcal{V} = \left\{(X_\alpha, \deg(\alpha)) : \deg(\alpha) \text{ is nonzero in only one component}\right\}.$$
$(\mathcal{C}_Z^s)$ states that there is a finite subset $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ such that $\mathcal{F}$ generates a finite list and this finite list controls γ. Note that both "generates a finite list" and "controls" in the above depend implicitly on the set $\mathcal{A} \subseteq [0,1]$, the chosen compact set $K_0 \Subset \Omega''$, and the multi-parameter dilations e.

- $\left(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^s\right)$: Write $\gamma_t \sim \exp\left(\sum_{|\alpha|>0} t^\alpha \widehat{X}_\alpha\right)$. $\left(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^s\right)$ is the same as $(\mathcal{C}_Z^s)$ except $\mathcal{V}$ is replaced by
$$\mathcal{V} = \left\{\left(\widehat{X}_\alpha, \deg(\alpha)\right) : \deg(\alpha) \text{ is nonzero in only one component}\right\}.$$

- $(\mathcal{C}_Y^s)$: For each j, $1 \leq j \leq N$, define,
$$W_j(t) = d\gamma\left(t, \gamma_t^{-1}(x)\right)\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t_j}\right) = \frac{d}{ds_j}\bigg|_{s=0} \gamma_{t+s} \circ \gamma_t^{-1}(x).$$
Write $W_j(t) \sim \sum_\alpha t^\alpha X_{\alpha,j}$. $(\mathcal{C}_Y^s)$ is the same as $(\mathcal{C}_Z^s)$ except $\mathcal{V}$ is replaced by
$$\mathcal{V} = \left\{(X_{\alpha,j}, \deg(\alpha) + e_j) : \deg(\alpha) + e_j \text{ is nonzero in only one component}\right\},$$
where e denotes the chosen multi-parameter dilations.

Proposition 12.16. $\left(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^s\right) \Leftrightarrow (\mathcal{C}_Y^s) \Leftrightarrow (\mathcal{C}_Z^s)$.

Proof sketch. Using the Campbell-Hausdorff formula, the vector fields $\widehat{X}_\alpha$ can be written in terms of the vector fields X_α (respectively, $X_{\alpha,j}$). This can be seen just as in Proposition 9.6 of [CNSW99]. It is not hard to see, using the form of this correspondence (which we have not made precise), that $(\mathcal{C}_Z^s)$ and $(\mathcal{C}_Y^s)$ are both equivalent to $\left(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^s\right)$. ☐

Remark 12.17. Under the equivalent assumptions $(\mathcal{C}_Z^s)$, $\left(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^s\right)$, and $(\mathcal{C}_Y^s)$, the assumptions of Proposition 12.13 hold. The conclusion of Proposition 12.13 can be seen as $(\mathcal{C}_J^s)$. Note that each of $(\mathcal{C}_Z^s)$, $\left(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^s\right)$, and $(\mathcal{C}_Y^s)$ comes with an intrinsic family of vector fields from which we can construct the scaling map $\Phi_{x_0,\delta}$ (for each $\delta \in \mathcal{A}$, $x_0 \in K_0$), which we use to make sense of $(\mathcal{C}_J^s)$. There is no such intrinsic family of vector fields corresponding to $(\mathcal{C}_J^s)$, and we therefore cannot discuss any sort of reverse implication in this sense. Of course, if we fix a choice of the list of vector fields (X,d), then all four conditions are (in a sense) equivalent, since the pullback of them under Φ corresponds to $(\mathcal{C}_Z^u)$, $\left(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^u\right)$, $(\mathcal{C}_Y^u)$, and $(\mathcal{C}_J^u)$, respectively (which we know to be equivalent). More specifically, if we define $\theta_t^{x_0,\delta} = \Phi_{x_0,\delta}^{-1} \circ \gamma_{\delta t} \circ \Phi_{x_0,\delta}$ then $\left\{\theta^{x_0,\delta} : x_0 \in K_0, \delta \in \mathcal{A}\right\}$ satisfies $(\mathcal{C}_Z^u)$, $\left(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^u\right)$, and $(\mathcal{C}_Y^u)$, respectively, if and only if γ satisfies $(\mathcal{C}_Z^s)$, $\left(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^s\right)$, and $(\mathcal{C}_Y^s)$ respectively. We then say that γ satisfies $(\mathcal{C}_J^s)$ if $\left\{\theta^{x_0,\delta} : x_0 \in K_0, \delta \in \mathcal{A}\right\}$ satisfies $(\mathcal{C}_J^u)$. This idea can also be used to provide another proof of Proposition 12.16.

12.2 Proof of Proposition 11.12

In this section, we exhibit the proof of Proposition 11.12. Let $\left(Z,\tilde{d}\right)$ be vector fields with single-parameter formal degrees satisfying the assumptions in Section 11 for a fixed $x_0 \in \Omega$; i.e., the same setup as in Section 12. For each multi-index α with $|\alpha| \leq L$, let V_α be a C^∞ vector field. Though it will not play an essential role in this section, assign to V_α the formal degree $\left|\deg\left(\alpha\right)\right|_1$. Let $\widehat{\gamma}_t$ be given by,

$$\widehat{\gamma}_t\left(x\right) = e^{\sum_{0<|\alpha|\leq L} t^\alpha V_\alpha} x.$$

Proposition 11.12 will follow immediately by applying the following lemma with $\left(Z,\tilde{d}\right) = (\delta X, \sum d)$, with $\delta \in \mathcal{A}$, and $x_0 \in K$, and taking $\widehat{\gamma}_t = \gamma_{\delta t}$.

Lemma 12.18. *$\left(Z,\tilde{d}\right)$ controls $\widehat{\gamma}$ at the unit scale near x_0 if and only if $\left(Z,\tilde{d}\right)$ controls $\left(V_\alpha, \left|\deg\left(\alpha\right)\right|_1\right)$ at the unit scale near x_0, in the sense that if $\widehat{\gamma}$ satisfies $\mathcal{Q}_2$ then $\left(V_\alpha, \left|\deg\left(\alpha\right)\right|_1\right)$ satisfies $\mathcal{P}_2$ and the parameters of $\mathcal{P}_2$ can be chosen to be 2-admissible constants depending also on the parameters of $\mathcal{Q}_2$. Conversely, if $\left(V_\alpha, \left|\deg\left(\alpha\right)\right|_1\right)$ satisfies $\mathcal{P}_2$ for each α, then $\widehat{\gamma}$ satisfies $\mathcal{Q}_2$ and the parameters for $\mathcal{Q}_2$ can be chosen to be 2 admissible constants depending also on the parameters for $\mathcal{P}_2$.*

Proof. Let U_α be the pullback of V_α via the map Φ, and let $\theta_t\left(u\right) = \Phi^{-1} \circ \widehat{\gamma}_t \circ \Phi\left(u\right)$. Note that,

$$\theta_t\left(u\right) = e^{\sum_{0<|\alpha|\leq L} t^\alpha U_\alpha} u.$$

Then, the statement of the lemma can be restated as saying, for some $\rho_2, \eta_2 > 0$,

$$\left\|U_\alpha\right\|_{C^m\left(B^{n_0}\left(\eta_2\right)\right)} \lesssim 1, \quad \forall \alpha, \quad \forall m,$$

if and only if,

$$\left\|\theta\right\|_{C^m\left(B^N\left(\rho_2\right)\times B^{n_0}\left(\eta_2\right)\right)} \lesssim 1, \quad \forall m.$$

This is well known. □

12.3 T^* is of the same form as T

In this section, we prove the following proposition.

Proposition 12.19. *If T satisfies all of the assumptions of Theorem 7.2, then so does T^*, where T^* is the L^2 adjoint of T.*

Recall, T is of the form,

$$T\left(f\right)\left(x\right) = \psi_1\left(x\right) \int f\left(\gamma_t\left(x\right)\right) \psi_2\left(\gamma_t\left(x\right)\right) \kappa\left(t,x\right) K\left(t\right)\, dt;$$

see Theorem 7.2 for further details. Since we are assuming $K\left(t\right)$ has small support (and we are allowed to choose how small, depending on γ), we may without loss of generality assume that $\det \frac{\partial \gamma}{\partial x}\left(t,x\right) \geq \frac{1}{2}$ on the support of K (since $\det \frac{\partial \gamma}{\partial x}\left(0,x\right) = 1$). Note that,

$$\begin{aligned} T^*\left(f\right)\left(x\right) &= \overline{\psi_2\left(x\right)} \int \overline{\psi_1\left(\gamma_t^{-1}\left(x\right)\right) \kappa\left(t, \gamma_t^{-1}\left(x\right)\right)} f\left(\gamma_t^{-1}\left(x\right)\right) \left(\det \frac{\partial \gamma}{\partial x}\left(t, \gamma_t^{-1}\left(x\right)\right)\right)^{-1} K\left(t\right)\, dt \\ &= \overline{\psi_2\left(x\right)} \int \overline{\psi_1\left(\gamma_t^{-1}\left(x\right)\right)} \widetilde{\kappa}\left(t, \gamma_t^{-1}\left(x\right)\right) f\left(\gamma_t^{-1}\left(x\right)\right) K\left(t\right)\, dt, \end{aligned}$$

where $\widetilde{\kappa}\left(t,x\right) = \overline{\kappa\left(t, \gamma_t^{-1}\left(x\right)\right)} \left(\det \frac{\partial \gamma}{\partial x}\left(t, \gamma_t^{-1}\left(x\right)\right)\right)^{-1}$. From here it is immediate to see that Proposition 12.19 follows from the following lemma.

Lemma 12.20. *γ_t satisfies all of the hypotheses of Theorem 7.2 if and only if γ_t^{-1} does.*

Proof. We show that γ_t satisfies $\left(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^s\right)$ if and only if γ_t^{-1} satisfies $\left(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^s\right)$, and the result will follow from Proposition 12.16. Since the result is symmetric in γ_t and γ_t^{-1} we show only one direction.

Suppose γ_t satisfies $\left(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^s\right)$. Thus we assume that our list of vector fields (X, d) is generated by vector fields of the form $\left(\widehat{X}_\alpha, \deg(\alpha)\right)$, where, $\gamma_t(x) \sim \exp\left(\sum_{|\alpha|>0} t^\alpha \widehat{X}_\alpha\right) x$. However, Lemma 9.3 of [CNSW99] shows, $\gamma_t^{-1}(x) \sim \exp\left(-\sum_{|\alpha|>0} t^\alpha \widehat{X}_\alpha\right) x$. Hence we may use the same list of vector fields to show that γ_t^{-1} satisfies $\left(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^s\right)$. The result will now follow once we show (X, d) controls γ_t^{-1}. Rephrasing this, it suffices to show that $\widehat{\gamma}_t^{-1}(x) := \gamma_{\delta t}^{-1}(x)$ is controlled by $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right) := (\delta X, \sum d)$ at the unit scale near x_0, uniformly for $x_0 \in K_0$ and $\delta \in \mathcal{A}$. However, our assumption on γ can be rephrased as saying that $\widehat{\gamma}_t$ is controlled by $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right)$ at the unit scale near x_0, uniformly for $x_0 \in K_0$ and $\delta \in \mathcal{A}$. The result now follows from Proposition 12.6. $\square$

13 The space L_δ^1

In this section, we review the results from Sections 7 and 13 of [CNSW99], concerning the space L_δ^1 (which is defined below). The situation we are interested in is as follows. Ψ will be a C^∞ mapping on the closure $\overline{B}$ of a finite ball B in $\mathbb{R}^d$ mapping to $\mathbb{R}^n$, with $d \geq n$. Consider a measure $\psi(\tau)\ d\tau$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$, where $\psi \in C_0^1(B)$. We define a measure μ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ by the integration formula,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(y)\ d\mu(y) = \int_{\overline{B}} f(\Psi(\tau))\, \psi(\tau)\ d\tau;$$

that is, μ is the transported measure $d\mu = \Psi_*(\psi d\tau)$.

The goal of this section is to discuss the fact that, under appropriate conditions, μ is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure and the Radon-Nikodym derivative $h(y) = \frac{d\mu(y)}{dy}$ possesses the following level of smoothness.

Definition 13.1. For $0 < \delta \leq 1$, $L_\delta^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is the Banach space of all functions $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |h(y-z) - h(y)|\ dy \leq C\,|z|^\delta, \quad \forall z \in \mathbb{R}^n. \tag{13.1}$$

The norm on L_δ^1 is defined to be $\|h\|_{L^1}$ plus the smallest C for which (13.1) holds.

Proposition 13.2 (Proposition 7.2 of [CNSW99])**.** *Suppose that, for some multi-index α,*

$$\left|\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau}\right)^\alpha \det_{n\times n} \frac{\partial\Psi}{\partial\tau}(\tau)\right|_\infty \neq 0, \quad \forall \tau \in \overline{B}. \tag{13.2}$$

Then the transported measure $d\mu = \Psi_*(\psi d\tau)$ is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure, and its Radon-Nikodym derivative h belongs to L_δ^1 for all $\delta < (2|\alpha|)^{-1}$. Moreover, the L_δ^1 norm of h can be bounded in terms of an upper bound for the $C^{|\alpha|+2}\left(\overline{B}\right)$ norm of Ψ, a lower bound for the left hand side of (13.2) in $\overline{B}$, an upper bound for the C^1 norm of ψ, the number δ, and an upper bound for $|\alpha|$.

Fix constants $C_1, C_2 < \infty$ and let $\zeta \in (0,1]$. Consider a non-negative measure Ξ on $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$ with the following properties.

- $\operatorname{supp}\Xi \subseteq \{(y,z) : |y|, |z| \leq C_1,\ |y-z| \leq C_1\zeta\}$.
- There exist bounded, nonnegative, measurable functions m_1, m_2 such that for every $f \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^n)$,

$$\int\int f(y)\ d\Xi(y,z) = \int f(y)\, m_1(y)\ dy,$$
$$\int\int f(z)\ d\Xi(y,z) = \int f(z)\, m_2(z)\ dz;$$

with,

$$m_1(y), m_2(z) \leq C_2.$$

Proposition 13.3 (See Proposition 13.1 of [CNSW99])**.** *Suppose $h \in L^1_\delta(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and Ξ is a measure as described above. Then, there exist $\delta', A \in (0,\infty)$ such that,*

$$\int |h(y) - h(z)| \, d\Xi(y,z) \leq A\zeta^{\delta'} \|h\|_{L^1_\delta};$$

where δ' depends only on δ and n, and A depends only on δ, n, and upper bounds for the constants C_1, C_2.

Proposition 13.3 is slightly different than Proposition 13.1 of [CNSW99]. Superficially, we have renamed $2^{-\nu}$ in [CNSW99] to be ζ here, and taken j and x in [CNSW99] to be 0. Furthermore, we have removed any aspect of the "lifting" procedure from [CNSW99] and we have replaced the quasi-distance d with Euclidean distance. Finally, we need not assume C_1 small as is done in [CNSW99] (though it would suffice for our purposes to take C_1 small). In any case, the proof in [CNSW99] immediately gives Proposition 13.3 as we have stated it.

14 A general L^2 theorem

In this section, we state and prove a general L^2 theorem, which we will use to complete the proof of Theorem 7.2. The goal is to develop a theorem which will imply

$$\left\| \left(T_j^* T_k T_k^* T_j\right)^2 \right\|_{L^2 \to L^2}, \left\| \left(T_j T_k^* T_k T_j^*\right)^2 \right\|_{L^2 \to L^2} \lesssim 2^{-\epsilon|j-k|}, \tag{14.1}$$

for some $\epsilon > 0$, where T_j and T_k are as in Section 10. We state this result in slightly greater generality than we presently need, as the more general result will play an essential role in [SS11a, SS11b]; in addition, this more general version only requires a small amount of extra work. Throughout this section we take $K_0 \Subset \Omega' \Subset \Omega'' \Subset \Omega$, as in Section 6. $a > 0$ will be a small number to be chosen later, depending on the particular operators we study. We will see, though, that $a > 0$ may be chosen independent of j, k in (14.1).

The setting is as follows. We are given operators $S_1, \ldots, S_L$, R_1 and R_2, and a real number $\zeta \in (0,1]$. We will present conditions on these operators such that there exists $\epsilon > 0$ with,

$$\|S_1 \cdots S_L (R_1 - R_2)\|_{L^2 \to L^2} \lesssim \zeta^\epsilon.$$

In Section 15 we will show that the assumptions of this section hold uniformly when applied to (14.1), in an appropriate sense, and this will allow us to establish (14.1), and complete the proof of Theorem 7.2.

To describe our assumptions we suppose we are given C^∞ vector fields $Z_1, \ldots, Z_q$ on Ω with *single*-parameter formal degrees $\tilde{d}_1, \ldots, \tilde{d}_q$.[37] We assume that $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right)$ satisfies all of the assumptions of Theorem 11.1, uniformly for $x_0 \in K_0$, for some fixed $\xi > 0$. Furthermore, we assume that r of the vector fields, $Z_1, \ldots, Z_r$, M-generate $Z_1, \ldots, Z_q$, for some $M > 0$ (see Definition 12.8).

We now turn to defining the operators S_j. We assume, for each j, we are given a C^∞ function $\widehat{\gamma}_j : B^{N_j}(\rho) \times \Omega'' \to \Omega$ satisfying $\widehat{\gamma}_j(0,x) \equiv x$. We assume that each $\widehat{\gamma}_j$ is controlled at the unit scale by $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right)$.[38] As usual, we restrict our attention to $\rho > 0$ small, so that $\widehat{\gamma}_{j,t}^{-1}$ makes sense wherever we use it. We suppose we are given $\psi_{j,1}, \psi_{j,2} \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ supported on the interior of K_0 and $\kappa_j \in C^\infty\left(\overline{B^{N_j}(a)} \times \overline{\Omega'}\right)$. Finally, we suppose we are given $\varsigma_j \in C_0^\infty\left(B^{N_j}(a)\right)$. We define,

$$S_j f(x) = \psi_{j,1}(x) \int f\left(\widehat{\gamma}_{j,t}(x)\right) \psi_{j,2}\left(\widehat{\gamma}_{j,t}(x)\right) \kappa_j(t,x) \varsigma_j(t) \, dt.$$

---

[37] The single-parameter degrees do not play an essential role in this section, and are only present to facilitate our applications of the results in this section.

[38] By this we mean that they are controlled by $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right)$ at the unit scale near x_0 for every $x_0 \in K_0$, uniformly in x_0.

Note that, under the above assumptions,

$$\|S_j\|_{L^\infty \to L^\infty}, \|S_j\|_{L^1 \to L^1} \lesssim 1; \tag{14.2}$$

and furthermore S_j^* is of the same form as S_j with $\widehat{\gamma}_{j,t}$ replaced by $\widehat{\gamma}_{j,t}^{-1}$ (c.f. Section 12.3).

Definition 14.1. If S_j is of the above form, we say that S_j is controlled by $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right)$ at the unit scale.

Remark 14.2. Since $\widehat{\gamma}_{j,t}$ is controlled at the unit scale if and only if $\widehat{\gamma}_{j,t}^{-1}$ is (Proposition 12.6) S_j is controlled at the unit scale if and only if S_j^* is. Furthermore, if $\widehat{\gamma}_{j_1,t_1}$ and $\widehat{\gamma}_{j_2,t_2}$ are controlled at the unit scale, then so is $\widehat{\gamma}_{j_1,t_1} \circ \widehat{\gamma}_{j_2,t_2}$ (Proposition 12.6), and therefore, if S_{j_1} and S_{j_2} are controlled at the unit scale, then so is $S_{j_1} S_{j_2}$.

We assume, further, that for each l, $1 \leq l \leq r$, there is a j $(1 \leq j \leq L)$, and a multi-index α (with $|\alpha| \leq B$, where $B \in \mathbb{N}$ is some fixed constant which our results are allowed to depend on), such that,

$$Z_l(x) = \frac{1}{\alpha!} \frac{\partial}{\partial t}^{\alpha}\bigg|_{t=0} \frac{d}{d\epsilon}\bigg|_{\epsilon=1} \widehat{\gamma}_{j,\epsilon t} \circ \widehat{\gamma}_{j,t}^{-1}(x).$$

This concludes our assumptions on $S_1, \ldots, S_L$.

Remark 14.3. Note that $\widehat{\gamma}_1, \ldots, \widehat{\gamma}_L$ were chosen so that

$$\widehat{\gamma}_{(t_1,\ldots,t_L,s_1,\ldots,s_L)}(x) = \widehat{\gamma}_{L,t_L} \circ \widehat{\gamma}_{L-1,t_{L-1}} \circ \cdots \circ \widehat{\gamma}_{1,t_1} \circ \widehat{\gamma}_{1,s_1}^{-1} \circ \widehat{\gamma}_{2,s_2}^{-1} \circ \cdots \circ \widehat{\gamma}_{L,s_L}^{-1}(x). \tag{14.3}$$

would satisfy the hypotheses (and therefore the conclusions) of Theorem 12.11 and Corollary 12.12.

We now turn to the operators R_1 and R_2. It is here where the number ζ plays a role. We assume we are given a C^∞ function $\widetilde{\gamma}_{t,s}$ (with $\widetilde{\gamma}_{0,0}(x) \equiv x$), which is controlled by $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right)$ at the unit scale:[39]

$$\widetilde{\gamma}(t,s,x) : B^{\widetilde{N}}(\rho) \times [-1,1] \times \Omega'' \to \Omega, \quad \widetilde{\gamma}_{0,0}(x) \equiv x.$$

Remark 14.4. Here, we are thinking of (t,s) as playing the role of the t variable in the definition of control.

We suppose we are given $\widetilde{\kappa}(t,s,x) \in C^\infty\left(\overline{B^{\widetilde{N}}(a)} \times [-1,1] \times \Omega''\right)$, $\widetilde{\varsigma}(t) \in L^1\left(B^N(a)\right)$, and $\widetilde{\psi}_1, \widetilde{\psi}_2 \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ supported on the interior of K_0. We define, for $\xi \in [-1,1]$,

$$R^\xi f(x) = \widetilde{\psi}_1(x) \int f\left(\widetilde{\gamma}_{t,\xi}(x)\right) \widetilde{\psi}_2\left(\widetilde{\gamma}_{t,\xi}(x)\right) \widetilde{\kappa}(t,\xi,x)\, \widetilde{\varsigma}(t)\, dt.$$

Note that we have,

$$\left\|R^\xi\right\|_{L^1 \to L^1}, \left\|R^\xi\right\|_{L^\infty \to L^\infty} \lesssim 1. \tag{14.4}$$

We set $R_1 = R^\zeta$ and $R_2 = R^0$.

Theorem 14.5. *In the above setup, if $a > 0$ is chosen sufficiently small, we have,*

$$\|S_1 \cdots S_L (R_1 - R_2)\|_{L^2 \to L^2} \leq C \zeta^\epsilon,$$

for some $\epsilon > 0$.

Remark 14.6. It is important that a, C, and ϵ may be chosen independent of any relevant parameters. We say merely, that a, C, and ϵ can be chosen to depend only on the norms of the various functions used to define S_j, R_1, and R_2, on the parameters B and M, on L, on the various dimensions, on the parameters in the definition of control (when using $\mathcal{Q}_2$), and on anything that 2-admissible constants were allowed to depend on as in Section 11. The reader wishing to, should have no trouble keeping track of the various dependencies in our argument.

---

[39] In most of our applications, $\widetilde{\gamma}_{t,s}$ will be of the form $\widehat{\gamma}_{s \cdot t}$, where $\widehat{\gamma}_t$ is controlled by $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right)$ at the unit scale and $s \cdot t$ scales each coordinate of t by a non-negative integer power of s.

The rest of this section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 14.5. The reader not immediately interested in the details may safely skip to Section 15 to see how Theorem 14.5 is used.

Remark 14.7. Note that in the equivalence between $\mathcal{Q}_1$ and $\mathcal{Q}_2$, we used that we were able to shrink the t variable. For instance, to define θ in the definition of $\mathcal{Q}_2$, we restricted attention to $|t| < \eta'$, where $\eta' \approx 1$. Thus, we must be able to restrict attention to $s \leq c$ where $c \gtrsim 1$ when working with $\widetilde{\gamma}_{t,s}$. Since, in the definition R_1 and R_2 we fix s to be ζ and 0, respectively, it suffices to note that we may restrict attention to $\zeta \leq c$ in Theorem 14.5. This is clear, since when $1 \geq \zeta \geq c$, Theorem 14.5 is trivial. Henceforth, we assume ζ is small enough that all our definitions make sense.

Define $S = S_1 \cdots S_L$ and $R = R_1 - R_2$. In what follows, $\epsilon > 0$ will be a positive number that may change from line to line. We wish to show,

$$\|SR\|_{L^2 \to L^2} \lesssim \zeta^\epsilon,$$

and it suffices to show,

$$\|R^* S^* S R\|_{L^2 \to L^2} \lesssim \zeta^\epsilon.$$

Using (14.4), we have $\|R^*\|_{L^2 \to L^2} \lesssim 1$, and therefore it suffices to show,

$$\|S^* S R\|_{L^2 \to L^2} \lesssim \zeta^\epsilon.$$

Continuing in this manner, it suffices to show,

$$\left\| \left(S^* S\right)^{2^m} R \right\|_{L^2 \to L^2} \lesssim \zeta^\epsilon, \tag{14.5}$$

for some $m > 0$. Since $\|S\|_{L^2 \to L^2}, \|S^*\|_{L^2 \to L^2} \lesssim 1$ by (14.2), it suffices to show,

$$\|\left(S^* S\right)^n R\|_{L^2 \to L^2} \lesssim \zeta^\epsilon; \tag{14.6}$$

where we have just taken m so large $2^m \geq n$ and applied (14.5).

Combining (14.2) and (14.4) we see,

$$\|\left(S^* S\right)^n R\|_{L^1 \to L^1} \lesssim 1,$$

and so interpolation shows that to prove (14.6) we need only show,

$$\|\left(S^* S\right)^n R\|_{L^\infty \to L^\infty} \lesssim \zeta^\epsilon. \tag{14.7}$$

Let f be a bounded measurable function. Rephrasing (14.7), we wish to show,

$$\left|\left(S^* S\right)^n R f\left(x_0\right)\right| \lesssim \zeta^\epsilon \|f\|_{L^\infty}, \tag{14.8}$$

for every $x_0 \in K_0$ (where we have used that fact that $S^* g$ is supported in K_0 for every g). We now fix x_0 and prove (14.8). All implicit constants in what follows can be chosen to be independent of $x_0 \in K_0$.

Define, $\widehat{\gamma}_t$ by (14.3). That is,

$$\widehat{\gamma}_{(t_1, \ldots, t_L, s_1, \ldots, s_L)}\left(x\right) = \widehat{\gamma}_{L, t_L} \circ \widehat{\gamma}_{L-1, t_{L-1}} \circ \cdots \circ \widehat{\gamma}_{1, t_1} \circ \widehat{\gamma}_{1, s_1}^{-1} \circ \widehat{\gamma}_{2, s_2}^{-1} \circ \cdots \circ \widehat{\gamma}_{L, s_L}^{-1}\left(x\right).$$

Thus, $\widehat{\gamma}$ is controlled at the unit scale by $\left(Z, \vec{d}\right)$, and $S^* S$ is given by,

$$S^* S f\left(x\right) = \psi_1\left(x\right) \int f\left(\widehat{\gamma}_t\left(x\right)\right) \psi_2\left(\widehat{\gamma}_t\left(x\right)\right) \kappa\left(t, x\right) \varsigma\left(t\right)\, dt,$$

where $\varsigma \in C_0^1\left(B^N\left(a'\right)\right)$, $a' > 0$ is a small number depending on a (from here on out, $a' > 0$ will be a small number (depending on $a > 0$) that may change from line to line), $N = \sum_{j=1}^L 2N_j$, $\kappa \in C^\infty$, and $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in C_0^\infty$ are supported in the interior of K_0. Define, for $\tau = \left(t_1, \ldots, t_n\right)$ ($t_j \in B^N\left(a'\right)$),

$$\Gamma_\tau\left(x\right) = \widehat{\gamma}_{t_1} \circ \widehat{\gamma}_{t_2} \circ \cdots \circ \widehat{\gamma}_{t_n}\left(x\right).$$

So that,

$$\left(S^*S\right)^n f\left(x\right) = \psi_1\left(x\right)\int f\left(\Gamma_\tau\left(x\right)\right)\psi_2\left(\Gamma_\tau\left(x\right)\right)\kappa\left(\tau,x\right)\varsigma\left(\tau\right)\ d\tau,$$

where the various functions have changed but are of the same basic form as before. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\left(S^*S\right)^n Rf\left(x\right) =&\psi_1\left(x\right)\int f\left(\widetilde{\gamma}_{t,\zeta}\circ\Gamma_\tau\left(x\right)\right)\widetilde{\psi}_2\left(\widetilde{\gamma}_{t,\zeta}\circ\Gamma_\tau\left(x\right)\right)\kappa\left(t,\zeta,\tau,x\right)\varsigma\left(\tau\right)\widetilde{\varsigma}(t)\ d\tau\ dt\\ &-\psi_1\left(x\right)\int f\left(\widetilde{\gamma}_{t,0}\circ\Gamma_\tau\left(x\right)\right)\widetilde{\psi}_2\left(\widetilde{\gamma}_{t,0}\circ\Gamma_\tau\left(x\right)\right)\kappa\left(t,0,\tau,x\right)\varsigma\left(\tau\right)\widetilde{\varsigma}(t)\ d\tau\ dt.\end{aligned}$$

Here, κ and $\psi_1,\widetilde{\psi}_2$ are C^∞, with ψ_1 and $\widetilde{\psi}_2$ supported on the interior of K_0. Now think of $x_0\in K_0$ as fixed. We wish to establish (14.8). The dependence of κ on x_0 is unimportant so we suppress it. Given a bounded measurable function f, we wish to study the integral,

$$I\left(f\right) = \int f\left(\widetilde{\gamma}_{t,\zeta}\circ\Gamma_\tau\left(x_0\right)\right)\kappa\left(t,\zeta,\tau\right)\varsigma\left(\tau\right)\widetilde{\varsigma}(t)\ d\tau\ dt - \int f\left(\widetilde{\gamma}_{t,0}\circ\Gamma_\tau\left(x_0\right)\right)\kappa\left(t,0,\tau\right)\varsigma\left(\tau\right)\widetilde{\varsigma}(t)\ d\tau\ dt.$$

Note that $\psi_1\left(x_0\right)I\left(f\widetilde{\psi}_2\right) = \left(S^*S\right)^n Rf\left(x_0\right)$. Theorem 14.5 now follows immediately from the following proposition,

Proposition 14.8. *For $a>0$ sufficiently small, there exists $\epsilon>0$ and C such that,*

$$\left|I\left(f\right)\right|\leq C\zeta^\epsilon \sup_{z\in B_{\left(Z,\tilde{d}\right)}\left(x_0,\xi\right)}\left|f\left(z\right)\right|;$$

where $a,\epsilon,$ and C may only depend on the parameters the constants of the same names were allowed to depend on in Theorem 14.5; see Remark 14.6.

We devote the remainder of this section to the proof of Proposition 14.8. First note that it suffices to consider only κ of the form,

$$\kappa\left(t,\zeta,\tau\right) = \kappa_1\left(\tau\right)\kappa_0\left(t,\zeta\right),$$

since every κ may be written as a rapidly converging sum of such terms. (This reduction is unnecessary, but simplifies notation in what follows.)

Proposition 12.6 shows that $\left(Z,\tilde{d}\right)$ controls $\widetilde{\gamma}_{t,s}\circ\Gamma_\tau$ at the unit scale near x_0, if $a>0$ is sufficiently small (and therefore t, s and τ are sufficiently small), then $\widetilde{\gamma}_{t,s}\circ\Gamma_\tau\left(x_0\right)\in B_{\left(Z,\tilde{d}\right)}\left(x_0,\xi_1\right)$ (see $\mathcal{Q}_2$). Hence, I only depends on the values of f on $B_{\left(Z,\tilde{d}\right)}\left(x_0,\xi_1\right)$. We may, therefore, restrict our attention to f of the form $g\circ\Phi$, where g is a function on $B^{n_0}\left(\eta_1\right)$; as the result would follow by taking $g=f\circ\Phi^{-1}$. Φ here is, as usual, the scaling map from Theorem 11.1, and depends on the particular point x_0. Note, in particular, $\Phi\left(0\right)=x_0$.

Define,

$$\begin{gathered}\widehat{\theta}_t = \Phi^{-1}\circ\widehat{\gamma}_t\circ\Phi,\\ \Theta_\tau = \Phi^{-1}\circ\Gamma_\tau\circ\Phi = \widehat{\theta}_{t_1}\circ\widehat{\theta}_{t_2}\circ\cdots\circ\widehat{\theta}_{t_n},\quad \tau=\left(t_1,\ldots,t_n\right),\\ \widetilde{\theta}_{t,s} = \Phi^{-1}\circ\widetilde{\gamma}_{t,s}\circ\Phi,\end{gathered}$$

We see,

$$\begin{aligned}I\left(g\circ\Phi\right) =& \int g\left(\widetilde{\theta}_{t,\zeta}\circ\Theta_\tau\left(0\right)\right)\kappa_0\left(t,\zeta\right)\kappa_1\left(\tau\right)\varsigma\left(\tau\right)\widetilde{\varsigma}(t)\ d\tau\ dt\\ &-\int g\left(\widetilde{\theta}_{t,0}\circ\Theta_\tau\left(0\right)\right)\kappa_0\left(t,0\right)\kappa_1\left(\tau\right)\varsigma\left(\tau\right)\widetilde{\varsigma}(t)\ d\tau\ dt.\end{aligned}\tag{14.9}$$

Note that, since κ_0 is C^∞, we have $\kappa_0(t,\zeta) = \kappa_0(t,0) + O(\zeta)$ uniformly in t. Combining this with (14.9), it is easy to see,

$$\begin{aligned} I(g\circ\Phi) = \int \left[g\left(\widetilde{\theta}_{t,\zeta}\circ\Theta_\tau(0)\right) - g\left(\widetilde{\theta}_{t,0}\circ\Theta_\tau(0)\right)\right] \kappa_0(t,0)\,\kappa_1(\tau)\,\varsigma(\tau)\,\widetilde{\varsigma}(t)\;d\tau\,dt \\ + O\left(\zeta \sup_{v\in B^{n_0}(\eta_1)} |g(v)|\right). \end{aligned} \tag{14.10}$$

Note that the error term in (14.10) is of the desired form. Thus, let $\widehat{I}(g)$ be the first term on the right hand side of (14.10). It suffices to bound $\left|\widehat{I}(g)\right|$.

Note that, in light of Remark 14.3, Corollary 12.12 shows that $\widehat{\theta}$ satisfies $(\mathcal{C}_J)$ uniformly in any relevant parameters, i.e., there exists a multi-index β (with $|\beta| \lesssim 1$) such that,[40]

$$\left| \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau}\right)^{\beta} \det_{n_0\times n_0} \frac{\partial\Theta}{\partial\tau}(\tau,0)\Big|_{\tau=0} \right| \gtrsim 1.$$

Since,

$$\|\Theta\|_{C^{|\beta|+1}} \lesssim 1, \text{ by } \mathcal{Q}_2,$$

we see that if we take $a>0$ sufficiently small,

$$\left| \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau}\right)^{\beta} \det_{n_0\times n_0} \frac{\partial\Theta}{\partial\tau}(\tau,0) \right| \gtrsim 1,$$

for all τ in the support of ς.

Applying Proposition 13.2, with $\Psi(\tau) = \Theta_\tau(0)$ and $\psi(\tau) = \kappa_1(\tau)\,\varsigma(\tau)$, we see that there exists $\delta \gtrsim 1$ and $h \in L^1_\delta(\mathbb{R}^n)$ (with $\|h\|_{L^1_\delta} \lesssim 1$) such that,[41]

$$\widehat{I}(g) = \int \left[g\left(\widetilde{\theta}_{t,\zeta}(u)\right) - g\left(\widetilde{\theta}_{t,0}(u)\right)\right] h(u)\,\kappa_0(t,0)\,\widetilde{\varsigma}(t)\;du\,dt.$$

Applying two changes of variables, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{I}(g) = \int g(v)\left(\det \frac{\partial \widetilde{\theta}^{-1}_{t,\zeta}}{\partial v}(v)\right) h\left(\widetilde{\theta}^{-1}_{t,\zeta}(v)\right)\kappa_0(t,0)\,\widetilde{\varsigma}(t)\;dv\,dt \\ - \int g(v)\left(\det \frac{\partial \widetilde{\theta}^{-1}_{t,0}}{\partial v}(v)\right) h\left(\widetilde{\theta}^{-1}_{t,0}(v)\right)\kappa_0(t,0)\,\widetilde{\varsigma}(t)\;dv\,dt \end{aligned}$$

Using that $\widetilde{\theta}(t,s,u)$ is C^∞ (uniformly in any relevant parameters, by $\mathcal{Q}_2$), we have

$$\left(\det \frac{\partial \widetilde{\theta}^{-1}_{t,\zeta}}{\partial v}(v)\right) = \left(\det \frac{\partial \widetilde{\theta}^{-1}_{t,0}}{\partial v}(v)\right) + O(\zeta),$$

and therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{I}(g) = \int g(v)\left(\det \frac{\partial \widetilde{\theta}^{-1}_{t,0}}{\partial v}(v)\right)\left(h\left(\widetilde{\theta}^{-1}_{t,\zeta}(v)\right) - h\left(\widetilde{\theta}^{-1}_{t,0}(v)\right)\right)\kappa_0(t,0)\,\widetilde{\varsigma}(t)\;dv\,dt \\ + O(\zeta) \sup_{v\in B^{n_0}(\eta')} |g(v)|. \end{aligned}$$

---

[40] Actually, when applied to $\widehat{\theta}$, $(\mathcal{C}_J)$ only requires we take a composition of n_0 terms, instead of the n terms used to define Θ. Since $n \geq n_0$ the result still holds.

[41] Of course, h is supported on the range $\Theta_\tau(0)$, and therefore supported in $B^{n_0}(\eta')$.

Using $\int \left|\kappa_0\left(t,0\right)\widetilde{\varsigma}\left(t\right)\right| \lesssim 1$, we have,

$$\left|\widehat{I}\left(g\right)\right| \lesssim \left\{\sup_{|t|\leq a}\left[\int_{B^{n_0}(\eta')}\left|h\left(\widetilde{\theta}_{1,t_1}^{-1}\left(v\right)\right)-h\left(\widetilde{\theta}_{2,t_2}^{-1}\left(v\right)\right)\right|\,dv\right]+\zeta\right\}\sup_{v\in B^{n_0}(\eta')}\left|g\left(v\right)\right|$$

The proof will now be completed by showing, for every $|t|\leq a$ (think of t as fixed),

$$\int\left|h\left(\widetilde{\theta}_{t,\zeta}^{-1}\left(v\right)\right)-h\left(\widetilde{\theta}_{t,0}^{-1}\left(v\right)\right)\right|\,dv \lesssim \zeta^{\epsilon}, \tag{14.11}$$

for some $\epsilon>0$. Define a measure Ξ by,

$$\int k\left(y,z\right)\,d\Xi\left(y,z\right)=\int_{B^{n_0}(\eta')}k\left(\widetilde{\theta}_{t,\zeta}^{-1}\left(v\right),\widetilde{\theta}_{t,0}^{-1}\left(v\right)\right)\,dv;$$

so that the left hand side of (14.11) becomes,

$$\int\left|h\left(y\right)-h\left(z\right)\right|\,d\Xi\left(y,z\right).$$

Since $\theta_{t,\zeta}^{-1}$ depends smoothly on ζ,

$$\left|\widetilde{\theta}_{t,\zeta}^{-1}\left(v\right)-\widetilde{\theta}_{t,0}^{-1}\left(v\right)\right|\lesssim\zeta.$$

Hence Ξ is supported on those (y,z) such that $|y-z|\lesssim\zeta$. Applying Proposition 13.3, we see,

$$\int\left|h\left(y\right)-h\left(z\right)\right|d\Xi\left(y,z\right)\lesssim\zeta^{\epsilon},$$

for some $\epsilon\gtrsim 1$. This establishes (14.11) and completes the proof.

15 Completion of the proof

In this section, we complete the proof of Theorem 7.2, using Theorem 14.5. We use the same notation as in Section 10, and we therefore take T_j (for $j\in-\log_2\mathcal{A}$) as given by (10.1). The goal is to show that the operator,

$$\sum_{j\in-\log_2\mathcal{A}}T_j$$

converges in the strong operator topology as bounded operators on L^2. This follows from the Cotlar-Stein lemma and the following result,

Proposition 15.1.

$$\left\|T_k^*T_j\right\|_{L^2\rightarrow L^2},\left\|T_jT_k^*\right\|_{L^2\rightarrow L^2}\lesssim 2^{-\epsilon|j-k|},$$

for some $\epsilon>0$.

This section is devoted to the proof of Proposition 15.1. The proof is essentially the same for the two terms, and so we only exhibit the proof for $\left\|T_k^*T_j\right\|_{L^2\rightarrow L^2}$. Throughout, $\epsilon>0$ may change from line to line, but will always be independent of j,k. We will show,

$$\left\|\left(T_j^*T_kT_k^*T_j\right)^2\right\|_{L^2\rightarrow L^2}\lesssim 2^{-\epsilon|j-k|}, \tag{15.1}$$

and the proof will be complete (with ϵ replaced by $\epsilon/4$).

Remark 15.2. In Section 10, instead of squaring $T_j^*T_kT_k^*T_j$, we raised it to the $n+1$ power. This will be implicit in this section, via our application of Theorem 14.5. Actually, the proof of Theorem 14.5 will (essentially) raise $T_j^*T_kT_k^*T_j$ to a power larger than $n+1$. However, the proof could be easily modified (in this special case) to raise it only to the $n+1$ power. This is not important for our purposes, though.

We set $j_0 = j \wedge k \in -\log_2 \mathcal{A}$. Let (X, d) be the list of vector fields from Section 6, and define $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right) = \left(2^{-j_0} X, \sum d\right)$. We will be using this $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right)$ in our application of Theorem 14.5. Take μ_0 so that,

$$|j_{\mu_0} - k_{\mu_0}| = |j - k|_\infty .$$

We assume first $j_{\mu_0} \geq k_{\mu_0}$ and remark on changes necessary to deal with the reverse situation at the end of the section. We assume $j_{\mu_0} > k_{\mu_0}$ as otherwise $|j - k| = 0$ and (15.1) is trivial (it is easy to see that $\|T_j\|_{L^2 \to L^2}, \|T_k\|_{L^2 \to L^2} \lesssim 1$).

First, we introduce the operators S_l which we will use in our application of Theorem 14.5. We set,

$$S_1 \cdots S_7 = T_j^* T_k T_k^* T_j T_j^* T_k T_k^*.$$

Thus our goal is to show,

$$\|S_1 \cdots S_7 T_j\|_{L^2 \to L^2} \lesssim 2^{-\epsilon |j-k|}.$$

First we claim that each S_j is controlled at the unit scale by $\left(Z, \tilde{d}\right)$ (see Definition 14.1). We prove just the result for T_j, the same proof works for T_k, and the claim follows since S_l is controlled at the unit scale if and only if S_l^* is (see Remark 14.2). By a simple change of variables in (10.1), we obtain,

$$T_j f(x) = \psi_1(x) \int f\left(\gamma_{2^{-j}t}(x)\right) \psi_2\left(\gamma_{2^{-j}t}(x)\right) \kappa\left(2^{-j}t, x\right) \varsigma_j(t)\ dt. \tag{15.2}$$

Proposition 12.5 shows that $\left(2^{-j_0} X, \sum d\right)$ controls $\gamma_{2^{-j_0}t}$ at the unit scale. Since $j_0 \leq j$ coordinatewise, Proposition 12.7 shows that $\left(2^{-j_0} X, \sum d\right)$ controls $\gamma_{2^{-j}t}$ at the unit scale. That T_j is controlled at the unit scale by $\left(2^{-j_0} X, \sum d\right)$ now follows immediately.

We now turn to the other part of our assumption on the S_l: that there are vector fields $Z_1, \ldots, Z_r$ which generate $Z_1, \ldots, Z_q$ that appear at the Taylor coefficients of

$$\left.\frac{d}{d\epsilon}\right|_{\epsilon=1} \widehat{\gamma}_{l,\epsilon t} \circ \widehat{\gamma}_{l,t}^{-1},$$

where $\widehat{\gamma}_l$ is the function defining S_l, for some l. For this purpose, we need only use $S_2 = T_k$ and $S_4 = T_j$. In light of (15.2), we see $\widehat{\gamma}_{2,t} = \gamma_{2^{-k}t}$, $\widehat{\gamma}_{4,t} = \gamma_{2^{-j}t}$. Now the result follows from Lemma 12.14, where we have taken $2^{-j_0} = \delta_0$, $2^{-j} = \delta_1$, and $2^{-k} = \delta_2$. Thus, $S_1, \ldots, S_7$ satisfy all the hypotheses of Theorem 14.5.

Before we define R_1 and R_2, we need to make some preliminary remarks. First, for the reader only interested in the class of kernels $\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}$, decompose $t \in \mathbb{R}^N$ as $t = (t_1, t_2)$, where $t_1 = t^\mu$ (as defined in Section 4.1). Note, by the definition of t^μ, when t is scaled (i.e., when we consider $2^{j-j_0}t$) all of the coordinates of t_1 are scaled by (at least) a factor of $2^{c\left(j_{\mu_0} - k_{\mu_0}\right)} = 2^{c|j-k|_\infty}$, where c is some constant depending on the dilations e. The reader uninterested in $\mathcal{K}$ may skip the rest of this paragraph. Since $j_{\mu_0} > k_{\mu_0}$, it follows that μ_0 is not $j, \mathcal{A}$-minimal (see Section 4.2). Letting $C \geq 1$ be as in Definition 4.4, take μ_1 such that $\mu_0 \preceq_{j,C,\mathcal{A}} \mu_1$ and there does not exist μ_2 with $\mu_1 \prec_{j,C,\mathcal{A}} \mu_2$. By definition, for every $\mu \in [\mu_1]_{j,C,\mathcal{A}}$, we have,

$$j_\mu - k_\mu \gtrsim j_{\mu_0} - k_{\mu_0} \geq |j - k|_\infty \gtrsim |j - k| . \tag{15.3}$$

For $t \in \mathbb{R}^N$, decompose $t = (t_1, t_2)$, where $t_1 = t_1^{[\mu_1]_{j,C,\mathcal{A}}}$ and $t_2 = t_2^{[\mu_1]_{j,C,\mathcal{A}}}$ (as in Section 4.2). By the definition of t_1, when t is scaled (i.e., when we consider $2^{j-j_0}t$) all of the coordinates of t_1 are scaled by (at least) a factor of $2^{c'(j_\mu - k_\mu)}$ for some $\mu \in [\mu_1]_{j,C,\mathcal{A}}$ (where c' depends on the dilations e). By (15.3), each coordinate of t_1 is scaled by at least a factor of $2^{c\left(j_{\mu_0} - k_{\mu_0}\right)} = 2^{c|j-k|_\infty}$.

Note by the definition of $t = (t_1, t_2)$ in the previous paragraph, we have (by our assumptions on K),

$$\int \varsigma_j(t)\ dt_1 = 0.$$

In addition, we have from the discussion in the previous paragraph, if $\left|2^{j-j_0}t\right| \leq 1$, then $2^{c|j-k|_\infty}|t_1| + |t_2| \leq a$. I.e., $\varsigma_j^{\left(2^{j-j_0}\right)}(t)$ is supported on $2^{c|j-k|_\infty}|t_1| + |t_2| \leq a$. Letting $\zeta = 2^{-c|j-k|_\infty}$, we see that we may rewrite,

$$\varsigma_j^{\left(2^{j-j_0}\right)}(t_1,t_2) = \frac{d\zeta^{-1}t_1}{dt_1}\widetilde{\varsigma}\left(\zeta^{-1}t_1,t_2\right),$$

where $\zeta^{-1}t_1$ given by the usual multiplication, $\frac{d\zeta^{-1}t_1}{dt_1}$ is the Radon-Nikodym derivative of this multiplication (and therefore is equal to ζ^{-m} where m is the dimension of the t_1 space), and $\widetilde{\varsigma} \in L^1\left(B^N(a)\right)$, uniformly in any relevant parameters.

Now consider,

$$\begin{aligned}
T_jf(x) =& \psi_1(x)\int f\left(\gamma_{2^{-j_0}(t_1,t_2)}(x)\right)\psi_2\left(\gamma_{2^{-j_0}(t_1,t_2)}(x)\right)\kappa\left(2^{-j_0}(t_1,t_2),x\right)\varsigma_j^{\left(2^{j-j_0}\right)}(t_1,t_2)\ dt_1\,dt_2\\
=& \psi_1(x)\int\Big[f\left(\gamma_{2^{-j_0}(t_1,t_2)}(x)\right)\psi_2\left(\gamma_{2^{-j_0}(t_1,t_2)}(x)\right)\kappa\left(2^{-j_0}(t_1,t_2),x\right)\\
&-f\left(\gamma_{2^{-j_0}(0,t_2)}(x)\right)\psi_2\left(\gamma_{2^{-j_0}(0,t_2)}(x)\right)\kappa\left(2^{-j_0}(0,t_2),x\right)\Big]\varsigma_j^{\left(2^{j-j_0}\right)}(t_1,t_2)\ dt_1\,dt_2\\
=& \psi_1(x)\int\Big[f\left(\gamma_{2^{-j_0}(\zeta t_1,t_2)}(x)\right)\psi_2\left(\gamma_{2^{-j_0}(\zeta t_1,t_2)}(x)\right)\kappa\left(2^{-j_0}(\zeta t_1,t_2),x\right)\\
&-f\left(\gamma_{2^{-j_0}(0t_1,t_2)}(x)\right)\psi_2\left(\gamma_{2^{-j_0}(0t_1,t_2)}(x)\right)\kappa\left(2^{-j_0}(0t_1,t_2),x\right)\Big]\widetilde{\varsigma}(t_1,t_2)\ dt_1\,dt_2.
\end{aligned}$$

This shows that T_j is of the form R_1-R_2; indeed, we merely take $\widetilde{\gamma}_{t_1,t_2,s} = \gamma_{2^{-j_0}(st_1,t_2)}$ and $\widetilde{\kappa}(t_1,t_2,s,x) = \kappa\left(2^{-j_0}(st_1,t_2),x\right)$. It is easy to verify that these choices satisfy the relevant hypotheses,[42] and we leave the details to the interested reader.

Theorem 14.5 applies to show,

$$\left\|S_1\cdots S_7\left(R_1-R_2\right)\right\|_{L^2\to L^2} \lesssim \zeta^{-\epsilon} = 2^{-\epsilon'|j-k|_\infty} \lesssim 2^{-\epsilon''|j-k|},$$

for some $\epsilon, \epsilon', \epsilon'' > 0$. This verifies (15.1) and completes the proof, in the case when $j_{\mu_0} \geq k_{\mu_0}$.

When $k_{\mu_0} \geq j_{\mu_0}$ the proof is similar. To bound,

$$\left\|\left(T_j^*T_kT_k^*T_j\right)^2\right\|_{L^2\to L^2},$$

we use the fact that $\|T_j\|_{L^2\to L^2}, \|T_k\|_{L^2\to L^2} \lesssim 1$, and instead bound,

$$\left\|T_j^*T_kT_k^*T_jT_j^*T_k\right\|_{L^2\to L^2}.$$

We take, $S_1\cdots S_5 = T_j^*T_kT_k^*T_jT_j^*$ and we define $R_1-R_2 = T_k$ in exactly the same way as we did for T_j above. The rest of the proof follows in exactly the same manner as above. This completes the proof of Proposition 15.1 and therefore of Theorem 7.2.

16 Kernels revisited

In this section, we further discuss the class of kernels $\mathcal{K}(N,e,a,\mathcal{A})$ defined in Section 4. None of the results here are used elsewhere in the paper, but we hope they will give the reader a better understanding of the class of kernels we use.

Lemma 16.1. *Every sum of the form* (4.4) *converges in the sense of distributions.*

---

[42] It is immediate to verify that $\gamma_{2^{-j_0}(st_1,t_2)}$ satisfies $\mathcal{Q}_2$, since $\gamma_{2^{-j_0}(t_1,t_2)}$ does.

Proof. Let C, $\mathcal{A}$, a, and $\{\varsigma_j\}$ be as in Definition 4.4. Fix $f \in C_0^\infty\left(\mathbb{R}^N\right)$. It suffices to show

$$\int \varsigma_j^{\left(2^j\right)}(t)\, f(t)\ dt = O\left(2^{-\epsilon|j|}\right),$$

for some $\epsilon > 0$. Fix $k = (k_1, \ldots, k_\nu) \in \mathcal{A}$. Note that there is an $\epsilon_0 > 0$ sufficiently small, such that for all but finitely many $j = (j_1, \ldots, j_\nu) \in -\log_2 \mathcal{A}$, there is a $\mu_0 = \mu_0(j)$ such that

$$|j - k| \leq \epsilon_0\left(j_{\mu_0} - k_{\mu_0}\right). \tag{16.1}$$

We ignore those finitely many j such that (16.1) does not hold, and we also assume $j \neq k$. Fixing j and μ_0 such that (16.1) holds, let μ_1 be such that $\mu_0 \preceq_{j,C,\mathcal{A}} \mu_1$ and such that there does not exist μ with $\mu_1 \prec_{j,C,\mathcal{A}} \mu$. Note that there exists $\epsilon_1 > 0$ (independent of j) such that

$$0 < |j - k| \leq \epsilon_0\left(j_{\mu_0} - k_{\mu_0}\right) \leq \epsilon_1\left(j_\mu - k_\mu\right), \text{ for every } \mu \in [\mu_1]_{j,C,\mathcal{A}}. \tag{16.2}$$

In fact, $\epsilon_1 = \frac{\epsilon_0}{C^2}$ will do. In light of (16.2), we see that μ_1 is not $j, \mathcal{A}$-minimal (since $\mu_1 \in [\mu_1]_{j,C,\mathcal{A}}$). Thus, we have,

$$\int \varsigma_j^{\left(2^j\right)}(t)\ dt_1^{[\mu_1]_{j,C,\mathcal{A}}} = 0.$$

Furthermore, on the support of $\varsigma^{\left(2^j\right)}(t)$, there is a $\mu \in [\mu_1]_{j,C,\mathcal{A}}$ and $\epsilon_2, \epsilon_3 > 0$ such that

$$\left|t_1^{[\mu_1]_{j,C,\mathcal{A}}}\right|_\infty \leq a 2^{-\epsilon_2\left(j_\mu - k_\mu\right)} \leq a 2^{-\epsilon_3|j-k|} \lesssim 2^{-\epsilon_3|j|},$$

where in the last inequality we have used that k is fixed. Thus, we see

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|\int \varsigma^{\left(2^j\right)}(t)\, f(t)\ dt\right| &= \left|\int \varsigma^{\left(2^j\right)}(t)\left[f\left(t_1^{[\mu_1]_{j,C,\mathcal{A}}}, t_2^{[\mu_1]_{j,C,\mathcal{A}}}\right) - f\left(0, t_2^{[\mu_1]_{j,C,\mathcal{A}}}\right)\right]\right| dt \\
&\lesssim 2^{-\epsilon_3|j|} \int \left|\varsigma^{\left(2^j\right)}(t)\right| dt \\
&= 2^{-\epsilon_3|j|} \int \left|\varsigma(t)\right| dt \\
&\lesssim 2^{-\epsilon_3|j|},
\end{aligned}$$

completing the proof. □

Next we turn to investigating the case when $\mathcal{A} = [0,1]^\nu$. In this case, we have the following:

Lemma 16.2. *Taking the same notation as in Definition 4.4, with $\mathcal{A} = [0,1]^\nu$, the cancellation condition* (4.5) *holds if and only if*

$$\int \varsigma_j(t)\ dt^\mu = 0, \ \textit{unless } j_\mu = 0, \tag{16.3}$$

where t^μ is as in the start of Section 4.1.

Proof. This follows from a straightforward application of the definitions. Indeed, in this case $-\log_2 \mathcal{A} = \mathbb{N}^\nu$. The result follows from noting that if $j = (j_1, \ldots, j_\nu) \in \mathbb{N}^\nu$, then μ is $j, [0,1]^\nu$-minimal if and only if $j_\mu = 0$. Furthermore, if $j_\mu \neq 0$, then it is easy to see that there is no $\mu' \neq \mu$ such that $\mu \preceq_{j,C,\mathcal{A}} \mu'$, for any $C \geq 1$. □

Proposition 16.3. $\delta_0 \in \mathcal{K}\left(N, e, a, [0,1]^\nu\right)$.

Proof. Fix $\eta \in C_0^\infty\left(B^N(a')\right)$ with $\int \eta = 1$, where $a' > 0$ is a small number to be chosen in a moment.

For $j \in \mathbb{N}^\nu$, define ς_j by

$$\varsigma_j^{\left(2^j\right)} = \sum_{\substack{p \in \{0,1\}^\nu \\ j - p \in \mathbb{N}^\nu}} (-1)^{\sum_\mu p_\mu}\, \eta^{\left(2^{j-p}\right)}. \tag{16.4}$$

It is clear that, for $a' > 0$ sufficiently small, $\{\varsigma_j\} \subset C_0^\infty\left(B^N(a)\right)$ is a bounded set.

Fix $j \in \mathbb{N}^\nu$ and μ such that $j_\mu \neq 0$. We wish to show

$$\int \varsigma_j(t)\ dt^\mu = 0,$$

and to do so, it suffices to show

$$\int \varsigma_j^{\left(2^j\right)}(t)\ dt^\mu = 0. \tag{16.5}$$

Consider the sum (16.4). For each choice of $\mu' \neq \mu$ and $p_{\mu'} \in \{0,1\}$ (with $j_{\mu'} - p_{\mu'} \geq 0$), the sum (16.4) contains two terms: one for $p_\mu = 1$ and one for $p_\mu = 0$. These two terms have opposite signs, and therefore the sum of their integrals against dt^μ is 0. (16.5) follows.

To complete the proof, we must show

$$\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}^\nu} \varsigma_j^{\left(2^j\right)} = \delta_0.$$

In light of Lemma 16.1, it suffices to show, for each $m > 0$,

$$\sum_{|j|_\infty \leq m} \varsigma_j^{\left(2^j\right)} = \eta^{(2^m,\ldots,2^m)}, \tag{16.6}$$

since $\eta^{(2^m,\ldots,2^m)} \to \delta_0$ in distribution as $m \to \infty$.

To see (16.6), fix $j \in \mathbb{N}^\nu$ with at least one coordinate less than m and the rest less than or equal to m. Let ν_0 denote the number of coordinates of j that are equal to m. It is easy to see that the coefficient of $\eta^{\left(2^j\right)}$ in the sum (16.6) is equal to

$$\sum_{\mu=0}^{\nu-\nu_0} (-1)^\mu \binom{\nu-\nu_0}{\mu} = 0,$$

whereas the coefficient of $\eta^{(2^m,\ldots,2^m)}$ is 1. This completes the proof of (16.6) and therefore the proposition. □

Lemma 16.2 will allow us to see product kernels as the special case of $\mathcal{K}\left(N, e, a, [0,1]^\nu\right)$ when each e_j is nonzero in precisely one coordinate. We begin by introducing the notion of a product kernel. Our main reference is [NRS01] and we refer the reader there for more details. The definition for product kernels is recursive on the number of products, ν, with $\nu = 1$ corresponding to the classical Calderón-Zygmund kernels. To define product kernels, suppose we are given a decomposition of $\mathbb{R}^N$, $\mathbb{R}^N = \mathbb{R}^{N_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}^{N_\nu}$, into ν homogeneous subspaces with given single-parameter dilations on each subspace. That is, for each μ we are given $e_1^\mu, \ldots, e_{N_\mu}^\mu \in (0,\infty)$. For $\delta \geq 0$ and $t = \left(t_1, \ldots, t_{N_\mu}\right) \in \mathbb{R}^{N_\mu}$, we define $\delta t = \left(\delta^{e_1^\mu} t_1, \ldots, \delta^{e_{N_\mu}^\mu} t_\mu\right)$. This, therefore, defines ν parameter dilations on $\mathbb{R}^N$: if $\delta = (\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_\nu) \in [0,\infty)^\nu$ and $t = \left(t^1, \ldots, t^\nu\right) \in \mathbb{R}^{N_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}^{N_\nu} = \mathbb{R}^N$, we define

$$\delta t = \left(\delta_1 t^1, \ldots, \delta_\nu t^\nu\right). \tag{16.7}$$

Definition 16.4 (See Definition 2.1.1 of [NRS01])**.** A product kernel on $\mathbb{R}^N$ relative to the above decomposition is a distribution K on $\mathbb{R}^N$ which coincides with a C^∞ function away from the coordinate subspaces $t_\mu = 0$ and which satisfies:

1. (Differential inequalities) For each multi-index $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_\nu)$,[43] there is a constant C_α so that

$$\left|\partial_{t^1}^{\alpha_1} \cdots \partial_{t^\nu}^{\alpha_\nu} K(t)\right| \leq C_\alpha \left|t^1\right|^{-\sum\left(1+\alpha_1^j\right)e_j^1} \cdots \left|t^\nu\right|^{-\sum\left(1+\alpha_\nu^j\right)e_j^\nu},$$

away from the coordinate subspaces.

---

[43] We write $\alpha_\mu = \left(\alpha_\mu^1, \ldots, \alpha_\mu^{N_\mu}\right)$.

2. (Cancellation conditions) These are defined recursively on ν, the case $\nu = 1$ corresponds to the usual Calderón-Zygmund operators.
   (a) For $\nu = 1$, given any C^∞ function ϕ supported on the unit ball with C^1-norm bounded by 1, and any $R > 0$,
   $$\int K(t)\,\phi(Rt)\;dt$$
   is bounded independently of ϕ and R.
   (b) For $\nu > 1$, given any μ, $1 \leq \mu \leq \nu$, any C^∞ function ϕ supported on the unit ball of $\mathbb{R}^{N_\mu}$ with C^1 norm bounded by 1, and any $R > 0$, the distribution
   $$K_{\phi,R}\left(t^1, \ldots, t^{\mu-1}, t^{\mu+1}, \ldots, t^\nu\right) = \int K(t)\,\phi(Rt^\mu)\;dt^\mu$$
   is a product kernel on the lower dimensional space which is a product of the $\mathbb{R}^{N_{\mu'}}$ for $\mu' \neq \mu$, uniformly in ϕ and R.

Let $\widehat{e}$ denote the multi-parameter dilations induced by (16.7). Then we have the following result:

Proposition 16.5. *Suppose K is a distribution supported in $B^N(a)$. Then, K is a product kernel as in Definition 16.4 if and only if $K \in \mathcal{K}\left(N, \widehat{e}, a, [0,1]^\nu\right)$.*

Proof. This follows easily from Corollary 2.2.2 of [NRS01]. □

We now turn to the notion of flag kernels. Flag kernels provide an easy to understand situation where one uses a choice of $\mathcal{A}$ other than $[0,1]^\nu$. For flag kernels, we take the same setup as above (flag kernels are special cases of product kernels). Here we think of the factors $\mathbb{R}^{N_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}^{N_\nu}$ as being ordered (for the product kernels, the order of the factors did not matter). Again, we write $t = \left(t^1, \ldots, t^\nu\right) \in \mathbb{R}^{N_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}^{N_\nu}$.

Definition 16.6 (See Definition 2.3.2 of [NRS01])**.** A flag kernel is a distribution K on $\mathbb{R}^N$ which coincides with a C^∞ function away from $t^\nu = 0$ and satisfies

1. (Differential inequalities) For each multi-index $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_\nu)$[44] there is a constant C_α such that for $t^\nu \neq 0$, we have
   $$\begin{aligned}\left|\partial_{t^1}^{\alpha_1} \cdots \partial_{t^\nu}^{\alpha_\nu} K(t)\right| \leq & C_\alpha \left(\left|t^1\right| + \cdots + \left|t^\nu\right|\right)^{-\sum\left(1+\alpha_1^j\right)e_j^1} \\ & \cdots \left(\left|t^{\nu-1}\right| + \left|t^\nu\right|\right)^{-\sum\left(1+\alpha_{\nu-1}^j\right)e_j^{\nu-1}} \left|t^\nu\right|^{-\sum\left(1+\alpha_\nu^j\right)e_j^\nu}.\end{aligned}$$
2. (Cancellation conditions) These are defined recursively on ν.
   (a) For $\nu = 1$, given any C^∞ function ϕ supported on the unit ball, with C^1 norm bounded by 1, and any $R > 0$,
   $$\int K(t)\,\phi(Rt)\;dt$$
   is bounded uniformly for ϕ and R.
   (b) For $\nu > 1$, given any μ, $1 \leq \mu \leq \nu$, any C^∞ function ϕ supported on the unit ball of $\mathbb{R}^{N_\mu}$ with C^1 norm bounded by 1, and any $R > 0$, the distribution
   $$K_{\phi,R}\left(t^1, \ldots, t^{\mu-1}, t^{\mu+1}, \ldots, t^\nu\right) = \int K(t)\,\phi(Rt^\mu)\;dt^\mu$$
   is a flag kernel on $\mathbb{R}^{N_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}^{N_{\mu-1}} \times \mathbb{R}^{N_{\mu+1}} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}^{N_\nu}$, uniformly in ϕ and R.

We state the following result without proof. It is a result of Nagel, Ricci, Stein, and Wainger.

---

[44] Again, we write $\alpha_\mu = \left(\alpha_\mu^1, \ldots, \alpha_\mu^{N_\mu}\right)$.

Proposition 16.7. *Let* $\mathcal{A} = \{(\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_\nu) \in [0,1]^\nu : \delta_1 \geq \delta_2 \geq \cdots \geq \delta_\nu\}$. *Suppose* K *is a distribution supported on* $B^N(a)$. *Then* K *is a flag kernel as above if and only if* K *is an element of* $\mathcal{K}(N, \widehat{e}, a, \mathcal{A})$. *Here,* $\widehat{e}$ *are the multi-parameter dilations defined earlier.*

We now present an interesting example of kernels, which are neither product kernels nor flag kernels, but are still of the form $\mathcal{K}(N, e, a, [0,1]^\nu)$. We work in the case $N = 3$ and we think of $\mathbb{R}^3$ as being identified with the three-dimensional Heisenberg group, $\mathbb{H}^1$ (though our example can be easily generalized to any stratified Lie group). If we write $(x, y, t) \in \mathbb{R}^3 = \mathbb{H}^1$ as coordinates, then the group law of $\mathbb{H}^1$ is given by

$$(x, y, t)(x', y', t') = (x + x', y + y', t + t' + 2(yx' - xy')). \tag{16.8}$$

We take $\nu = 2$ and consider the two parameter dilations given by $e_1 = (1, 0)$, $e_2 = (0, 1)$, and $e_3 = (1, 1)$.[45] That is, we take the two parameter dilations given by,

$$(\delta_1, \delta_2)(x, y, t) = (\delta_1 x, \delta_2 y, \delta_1 \delta_2 t). \tag{16.9}$$

It is easy to see that these dilations are automorphisms of the Heisenberg group. It follows from our theory that if $K \in \mathcal{K}\left(3, e, a, [0,1]^2\right)$, then the operator given by $f \mapsto f * K$ is bounded on L^2 where the convolution is taken in the sense of $\mathbb{H}^1$. We will see in Section 17.8, though, that when the convolution is taken in the sense of the usual Euclidean structure on $\mathbb{R}^3$, then the operator may not be bounded on L^2.

17 Examples

In this section, we present a number of examples to help elucidate the various aspects of Theorem 7.2.

17.1 Exponentials of vector fields

Let $\mathcal{A} \subseteq [0,1]^\nu$, $K_0 \Subset \Omega$, and e be as in the statement of Theorem 7.2. For each multi-index, α, $0 < |\alpha| \leq M$, let X_α be a C^∞ vector field on Ω. Define a function,

$$\gamma_t(x) = e^{\sum_{0 < |\alpha| \leq M} t^\alpha X_\alpha} x. \tag{17.1}$$

We say γ satisfies $(\mathcal{V})$, if the following conditions are satisfied:

- $\{(X_\alpha, \deg(\alpha)) : \deg(\alpha) \text{ is nonzero in precisely one component}\}$ generates a finite list (X, d). See Definition 5.3.
- The above obtained list (X, d) controls $(X_\alpha, \deg(\alpha))$ for every α with $\deg(\alpha)$ nonzero in more than one component (and thus for every α).

Proposition 17.1. γ *satisfies* $(\mathcal{V})$ *if and only if* γ *satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 7.2.*

Proof. This is a combination of Propositions 12.16 and 11.12. □

17.2 Nilpotent Lie groups

In this example, we investigate a special case of the previous example. In this example we take $\mathcal{A} = [0,1]^\nu$, and take $K_0 \Subset \Omega$ and e as in the previous example. Recall, we call α a *pure power* if $\deg(\alpha)$ is nonzero in precisely one component. Fix M large and for each α, $0 < |\alpha| \leq M$, which is a pure power, let X_α be a C^∞ vector field. For the non-pure powers, let $X_\alpha = 0$. Assume furthermore, that the iterated commutators of the X_α are eventually 0. Then, if γ is given by (17.1), γ trivially satisfies $(\mathcal{V})$ and therefore satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 7.2.

---

[45] The resulting kernels are not product kernels, since e_3 is nonzero in more than one component. These dilations are sometimes referred to as Zygmund dilations–see [FP97].

To give a concrete example of the above, let $X_1, \ldots, X_l$ be left invariant vector fields on a nilpotent Lie group. Consider the operator given by,

$$f \mapsto \psi(x) \int f\left(e^{t_1 X_1 + t_2 X_2 + \cdots + t_l X_l} x\right) K(t_1, \ldots, t_l)\, dt, \tag{17.2}$$

where $K(t_1, \ldots, t_l)$ is a product kernel relative to the decomposition of $\mathbb{R}^l = \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}$ (and K is supported sufficiently close to 0). Then, if $\psi \in C_0^\infty$ has small support, the operator given by (17.2) is automatically bounded on L^2.

Furthermore, by a simple scaling argument, if the Lie group has an appropriate family of dilations under which the vector fields are homogeneous (for instance if it is a stratified Lie group), then one may replace ψ with 1 on the right hand side of (17.2) and remove the restriction that K have small (or even compact) support.[46]

Note that we have not involved terms like $t_1 t_2 X$ in the exponential. These would not be pure powers, and so $(\mathcal{V})$ would not hold vacuously: one would need an additional condition on the vector fields to ensure that $(\mathcal{V})$ holds. In Section 17.5 we will discuss a translation invariant operator in Euclidean space of the form (17.2), except with non-pure powers as well, where $(\mathcal{V})$ does not hold, and moreover which is *not* bounded on L^2.

Remark 17.2. We will see in [SS11b] that the vector fields $X_1, \ldots, X_l$ can be replaced with *any* real analytic vector fields; not just left invariant vector fields on a nilpotent Lie group. In particular, they could be replaced by left invariant vector fields on any Lie group.

17.3 The L^2 result of Christ, Nagel, Stein, and Wainger

In this section, we show that the L^2 result of [CNSW99] (the $p = 2$ part of Theorem 9.2) is a special case of the main result of this paper (Theorem 7.2).[47] Thus, we are considering the single-parameter case $\nu = 1$. We take $\mathcal{A} = [0, 1]$ and fix single parameter dilations $e = (e_1, \ldots, e_N)$, $e_j \in (0, \infty)$, and $K_0 \Subset \Omega$ as in Theorem 7.2. In [CNSW99], e_j is taken to be 1 for every j, but this is not essential to their work.

The condition assumed in [CNSW99] on γ was that if X_α was given as in (6.1), then $\{X_\alpha\}$ satisfies Hörmander's condition at every point $x \in K_0$. See $(\mathcal{C}_Z)$ in Section 9.

Proposition 17.3. *Under the above hypothesis, $(\mathcal{C}_Z)$, γ satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 7.2.*

Proof. Let $\{(X_1, d_1), \ldots, (X_r, d_r)\}$ be a finite subset of $\{(X_\alpha, \deg(\alpha))\}$ such that $X_1, \ldots, X_r$ satisfy Hörmander's condition. Assume that $X_1, \ldots, X_r$ satisfy Hörmander's condition of order m. That is, $X_1, \ldots, X_r$ along with their commutators up to order m span the tangent space at each point of K_0.

We recursively define single-parameter formal degrees on the commutators of $(X_\alpha, \deg(\alpha))$ in the usual way: if Y has formal degree d_1 and Z has formal degree d_2, we assign to $[Y, Z]$ the formal degree $d_1 + d_2$. Enumerate the list of all commutators of $X_1, \ldots, X_r$ up to order m along with their above defined formal degrees,

$$(X_1, d_1), \ldots, (X_L, d_L);$$

so that $X_1, \ldots, X_L$ span the tangent space at each point. Let $(X_1, d_1), \ldots, (X_q, d_q)$ be an enumeration of all the vector fields that can be written as a commutator of the X_α and such that their above defined formal degree is less than or equal to $\max_{1 \leq l \leq L} d_l$.[48] It is easy to see that there are only a finite number of such vector fields. Note, we are using in an essential way that the degrees are numbers, unlike in the multi-parameter case, where they are vectors.

We claim that, for $1 \leq i, j \leq q$,

$$[X_i, X_j] = \sum_{d_k \leq d_i + d_j} c_{i,j}^k X_k, \quad c_{i,j}^k \in C^\infty. \tag{17.3}$$

---

[46] By this we mean we can take any product kernel K as in Definition 16.4, without restricting our attention to those kernels with small support. This is the same as considering kernels in $\mathcal{K}(N, e, a, [0, \infty)^\nu)$ where e is chosen as in Proposition 16.5 and $a > 0$ is any real number. In this case, $\mathcal{K}$ is the same as $\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}$.

[47] Similar remarks hold for every $1 < p < \infty$, and this will be shown in [SS11a].

[48] We maintain the notation that $(X_1, d_1), \ldots, (X_L, d_L)$ are the first L of these vector fields with formal degrees.

Indeed, if $d_i + d_j \leq \max_{1\leq l\leq L} d_l$, then $\left(\left[X_i, X_j\right], d_i + d_j\right)$ is already in the list $\left(X_1, d_1\right), \ldots, \left(X_q, d_q\right)$ by definition. On the other hand, if $d_i + d_j > \max_{1\leq l\leq L} d_l$, we use the fact that,

$$\left[X_i, X_j\right] = \sum_{k=1}^{L} c_{i,j}^k X_k,$$

since $X_1, \ldots, X_L$ span the tangent space at each point. It was shown in Section 3 that the list $(X, d) = \left(X_1, d_1\right), \ldots, \left(X_q, d_q\right)$ satisfies $\mathcal{D}\left(K_0, [0,1]\right)$ if it satisfies (17.3).

Hence, to complete the proof of the proposition, we need only show that the list (X, d) controls γ. Let $W(t, x)$ be as in Definition 6.3, so that the vector fields $X_\alpha(x)$ are the Taylor coefficients of $W(t, x)$, when the Taylor series is taken in the t variable. Then we have,

$$W(\delta t, x) = \sum_{|\alpha|\leq M} t^\alpha \delta^{\deg(\alpha)} X_\alpha + O\left(|\delta t|^M\right). \tag{17.4}$$

Note, each term,

$$\delta^{\deg(\alpha)} X_\alpha = \sum_{k=1}^{q} c_k^\delta X_k, \quad c_k^\delta \in C^\infty \text{ uniformly in } \delta. \tag{17.5}$$

Indeed, if $\deg(\alpha) \leq \max_{1\leq l\leq L} d_l$, then $\left(X_\alpha, \deg(\alpha)\right)$ appears in the list $\left(X_1, d_1\right), \ldots, \left(X_q, d_q\right)$, by definition. On the other hand, if $\deg(\alpha) > \max_{1\leq l\leq L} d_l$, then we use the fact that $X_1, \ldots, X_L$ span the tangent space, and write,

$$X_\alpha = \sum_{l=1}^{L} c_l X_l, \quad c_l \in C^\infty. \tag{17.6}$$

Multiplying (17.6) by $\delta^{\deg(\alpha)}$ immediately yields (17.5).

Thus, each term of the sum on the right hand side of (17.4) has the desired form for the definition of control. To complete the proof, we need only show that the term $O\left(|\delta t|^M\right)$ has the desired form, provided M is sufficiently large. Take M so large that,

$$M \min_{1\leq j\leq N} e_j \geq \max_{1\leq l\leq L} d_l.$$

Then,

$$|\delta t|^M = O\left(\delta^{\max_{1\leq l\leq L} d_l}\right).$$

Using one last time that $X_1, \ldots, X_L$ span the tangent space, we see that we may write the $O\left(|\delta t|^M\right)$ term in the form,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{L} c_k^\delta(t, x)\, \delta^{\max_{1\leq l\leq L} d_l} X_k = \sum_{k=1}^{L} \widetilde{c}_k^\delta \delta^{d_k} X_k,$$

with $\widetilde{c}_k^\delta \in C^\infty$ uniformly in δ. This completes the proof that γ is controlled by (X, d), and therefore the proof of the proposition. □

Remark 17.4. As remarked in Section 3, even in the single-parameter case, Theorem 7.2 is more general than the L^2 result from [CNSW99]. Indeed, the result in this paper also applies in some situations when γ lies in the leaves of a (possibly singular) foliation. To apply the methods of [CNSW99] directly to a foliated manifold, one would need the foliation to be non-singular. See Section 3 for more details.

17.4 How the assumptions can fail

It is perhaps instructive to understand examples of γ where our assumptions do not hold. In this section, we exhibit γ which exemplify the various ways the assumptions can fail. We make no claim about whether or not the associated operators are bounded on L^2, and only claim that our theorem does not apply.

In the single parameter case ($\nu = 1$, $\mathcal{A} = [0, 1]$), there are three ways in which γ might fail to satisfy our assumptions.

1. The vector fields X_α (see (6.1)) might fail to generate a finite list. In the single-parameter case, this is essentially equivalent to failing to generate a locally finitely generated involutive distribution (see Lemma 3.2). For instance, let $X_1 = \partial_x$, $X_2 = e^{-\frac{1}{x^2}}\partial_y$, then the function $\gamma\left(t, (x, y)\right) : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ associated[49] to the vector field W given by
$$W\left(t, (x, y)\right) = tX_1 + t^2 X_2,$$
has this property.

2. If the X_α generate a locally finitely generated involutive distribution, this distribution foliates the ambient space into leaves. Our assumptions require that $\gamma_t\left(x\right)$ lies in the leaf of this foliation passing through x for every t. This is not always the case. For instance, $\gamma_t\left(x\right) : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ given by,
$$\gamma\left(t, x\right) : x \mapsto x - e^{-\frac{1}{t^2}},$$
does not lie in the appropriate leaf. In this case, all the X_α are 0 (and so each leaf is merely a point).

3. Even if the X_α generate a locally finitely generated involutive distribution, and $\gamma_t\left(x\right)$ lies in the appropriate leaf, it may still be that γ is not controlled by the list (X, d). We work on $\mathbb{R}$. Define the vector field $W\left(t, x\right)$ by,
$$W\left(t, x\right) = te^{-\frac{1}{x^2}}\partial_x + e^{-\frac{1}{t^2}}x\partial_x.$$
Let γ_t be function associated to this W (via Proposition 12.1). Note that,
$$\gamma_t\left(x\right) \text{ is } \begin{cases} \text{negative}, & \text{if } x \text{ is negative}, \\ \text{zero}, & \text{if } x \text{ is zero}, \\ \text{positive}, & \text{if } x \text{ is positive}. \end{cases}$$
In this case, there is only 1 X_α, namely $X_1 = e^{-\frac{1}{x^2}}\partial_x$. Thus, the leaves of the foliation are
$$\left(-\infty, 0\right), \quad \left\{0\right\}, \quad \left(0, \infty\right).$$
Hence, the proof will be complete if we can show that γ is not controlled by $\left(e^{-\frac{1}{x^2}}\partial_x, 1\right)$. If γ were controlled, it would imply, in particular, that there exists a $t_0 \neq 0$ such that for every x near 0, we have,
$$e^{-\frac{1}{t_0^2}}x = c\left(x\right)e^{-\frac{1}{x^2}},$$
with $c\left(x\right)$ bounded uniformly as $x \to 0$. This is clearly impossible.

Note that in each of the above examples, we used functions that vanished to infinite order at a point. One might wonder if such a phenomenon is essential in creating an example where our assumptions fail in the single parameter case. Indeed, it is essential. It turns out that, when restricting attention to real analytic γ, our assumptions are automatically satisfied in the single parameter case. This is taken up in [SS11b].

We now turn to our multi-parameter assumptions. Here, there is a new phenomenon which appears, even when considering real analytic γ: one may have that the vector fields corresponding to the non-pure powers are not controlled by the pure powers. For instance, consider the operator on $\mathbb{R}$ given by,
$$f \mapsto \psi\left(x\right) \int f\left(x - st\right)\, K\left(s, t\right)\, ds\, dt, \tag{17.7}$$
where K is a product kernel relative to the decomposition $(s, t) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ (and K is supported near 0). Here, there is only one vector field ∂_x given degree $(1, 1)$ (we are using the standard two-parameter dilations on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$). Thus, this example does not satisfy our assumptions. In fact, the methods in Section 17.5 can be used to show that there is a K such that (17.7) is not bounded on L^2.

---

[49] See Proposition 12.1 for the bijective correspondence between γ and the vector field W.

17.5 A translation invariant example

In this section, we investigate some translation invariant operators on $\mathbb{R}$, in the two-parameter setting. In particular, we will investigate operators on $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ given by,

$$T_K f(x) := \int f(x - p(s,t)) K(s,t) \, ds \, dt, \tag{17.8}$$

where p is a polynomial without a constant term and K is a product kernel on $\mathbb{R}^2$. That is we are taking the two-parameter dilations $e = ((1,0),(0,1))$, so that $(\delta_1, \delta_2)(s,t) = (\delta_1 s, \delta_2 t)$ and we are considering $K \in \mathcal{K}\left(2, e, a_0, [0,1]^2\right)$ for some small $a_0 > 0$.

Remark 17.5. Note we have not included a cutoff function in (17.8). Since K has small support, the value of $T_K f(x)$ only depends on the values of f near x. It is not hard to see, from this and the translation invariance of T_K, that T_K is bounded on L^2 if and only if ψT_K is bounded on L^2 for some C_0^∞ cut-off function ψ with $\psi \equiv 1$ on a neighborhood of 0.

Remark 17.6. We have restricted to one-dimensional, two-parameter operators for simplicity. The same methods in this section apply to higher dimensional higher parameter operators.

Remark 17.7. Results like the ones in this section date back to [NW77]. Thus, the results in this section are partially expository, though our perspective is somewhat different.

Write

$$p(s,t) = \sum_{|\alpha| \geq 1} c_\alpha (s,t)^\alpha .$$

Let $a > 0$ be the lowest a such that $c_{(a,0)} \neq 0$, and b be the lowest b such that $c_{(0,b)} \neq 0$. For simplicity, we assume $a, b < \infty$, but this it not necessary for what follows.

Theorem 17.8. *T_K is bounded on L^2 for every K with sufficiently small support if and only if whenever $c_{(e,f)} \neq 0$, we have that (e,f) lies on or above the line passing through $(a,0)$ and $(0,b)$.*

Proof. The if direction follows from Proposition 17.1. Indeed, if we set $\gamma_{(s,t)}(x) = x - p(s,t)$, then,

$$\gamma_{(s,t)}(x) = e^{-p(s,t)\partial_x} x.$$

To see that Proposition 17.1 applies, one merely needs to note that $(\partial_x, (a,0))$ and $(\partial_x, (0,b))$ control $(\partial_x, (e,f))$ if and only if (e,f) lies on or above the line passing through $(a,0)$ and $(0,b)$. This is easy to see directly, and is also covered in Example 5.16 of [Str11].

For the only if direction, we will show if there exists $c_{(e,f)} \neq 0$ and $\frac{1}{a} e + \frac{1}{b} f < 1$, then there exists a product kernel K with small support such that T_K is unbounded on L^2. Let e, f be such that $c_{(e,f)} \neq 0$ and $\frac{1}{a} e + \frac{1}{b} f$ is minimal among all such (e,f). Furthermore, we assume that e is minimal among these choices. Note that, by assumption, $0 \neq e, f$.

First we wish to reduce the question. Note that product kernels are a Fréchet space (see, for instance, Definition 16.4). Hence, by closed graph theorem, if T_K were bounded for each choice of K, then the map $K \mapsto T$ would be continuous as a map from the space of product kernels to the space of bounded operators on L^2 (given the uniform operator topology). Hence, to prove the theorem, it suffices to construct a sequence $\{K_j\}$ of product kernels such that,

- $\{K_j\}$ is a bounded set in the space of product kernels.
- The K_j all have arbitrarily small support.
- $\left\| T_{K_j} \right\|_{L^2 \to L^2} \to \infty$ as $j \to \infty$.

Take $\varsigma \in C_0^\infty((0,1))$ such that $\int \varsigma = 0$, and

$$\int \exp\left(i c_{(e,f)} s^e t^f\right) \varsigma(s) \varsigma(t) \, ds \, dt \neq 0. \tag{17.9}$$

Note that such a ς clearly exists. Indeed, take $\eta \in C_0^\infty(0,1)$ such that,

$$\int \eta(t)\ dt = 0, \quad \int \eta(s)\, s^e\ ds \neq 0, \quad \int \eta(t)\, t^f\ dt \neq 0.$$

We let $\eta^{(r)}(t) = r\eta(rt)$. Then, we have,

$$\begin{aligned}&\int \exp\left(ic_{e,f} s^e t^f\right) \eta^{(r)}(s)\, \eta^{(r)}(t)\ ds\, dt = \\ &\quad i\left(\int \eta(s)\, s^e\ ds\right)\left(\int \eta(t)\, t^f\ dt\right) c_{(e,f)} r^{-e-f} + O\left(r^{-e-f-1}\right),\ \text{as } r\to\infty.\end{aligned}$$

Taking $\varsigma = \eta^{(r)}$ for r sufficiently large, we obtain (17.9).

For M large, and $\tau >> M$ define,

$$K_{\tau,M}(s,t) := \sum_{\substack{0\leq j\leq M\\ k=-j\frac{e}{f}}} \varsigma^{\left(2^j\tau^{\frac{1}{a}}\right)}(s)\, \varsigma^{\left(2^k\tau^{\frac{1}{b}}\right)}(t).$$

Here, j is an integer, but k need not be. Note that $K_{\tau,M}$ is a product kernel[50] uniformly in τ and M. Furthermore, for M fixed and $\tau >> M$, $K_{\tau,M}$ has small support. We will show,

$$\limsup_{M\to\infty}\limsup_{\tau\to\infty}\left\|T_{K_{\tau,M}}\right\|_{L^2\to L^2} = \infty, \tag{17.10}$$

completing the proof.[51]

Let $m_0 = \frac{1}{a}e + \frac{1}{b}f$. To prove (17.10), it suffices to show,

$$\lim_{M\to\infty}\lim_{\tau\to\infty}\left|\int \exp\left(ip(s,t)\,\tau^{m_0}\right) K_{\tau,M}(s,t)\ ds\, dt\right| = \infty,$$

since this is just the absolute value of the multiplier of $T_{K_{\tau,M}}$ evaluated at τ^{m_0}.

Note that,

$$\begin{aligned}&\int \exp\left(ip(s,t)\,\tau^{m_0}\right) K_{\tau,M}(s,t)\ ds\, dt \\ &= \sum_{\substack{0\leq j\leq M\\ k=-j\frac{e}{f}}} \int \exp\left(ip(s,t)\,\tau^{m_0}\right) \varsigma^{\left(2^j\tau^{\frac{1}{a}}\right)}(s)\, \varsigma^{\left(2^k\tau^{\frac{1}{b}}\right)}(t)\ ds\, dt \\ &= \sum_{\substack{0\leq j\leq M\\ k=-j\frac{e}{f}}} \int \exp\left(ip\left(\tau^{-\frac{1}{a}}s, \tau^{-\frac{1}{b}}t\right)\tau^{m_0}\right) \varsigma^{\left(2^j\right)}(s)\, \varsigma^{\left(2^k\right)}(t)\ ds\, dt \\ &\xrightarrow[\tau\to\infty]{} \sum_{\substack{0\leq j\leq M\\ k=-j\frac{e}{f}}} \int \exp\left(i\sum_{\frac{1}{a}g+\frac{1}{b}h=m_0} c_{(g,h)}\,(s,t)^{(g,h)}\right) \varsigma^{\left(2^j\right)}(s)\, \varsigma^{\left(2^k\right)}(t)\ ds\, dt \\ &= \sum_{0\leq j\leq M} \int \exp\left(i\sum_{\frac{1}{a}g+\frac{1}{b}h=m_0} c_{(g,h)}\,(s,t)^{(g,h)}\, 2^{j\left(h\frac{e}{f}-g\right)}\right) \varsigma(s)\, \varsigma(t)\ ds\, dt.\end{aligned} \tag{17.11}$$

---

[50] For the $K_{\tau,M}$ to be product kernels, it is not necessary that $2^j\tau^{\frac{1}{a}}$ be of the form 2^l for some l (and similarly for $2^k\tau^{\frac{1}{b}}$).

[51] Actually, the methods below imply $\lim_{M\to\infty}\liminf_{\tau\to\infty}\left\|T_{K_{\tau,M}}\right\|_{L^2\to L^2} = \infty$, but this stronger statement is irrelevant for what we wish to prove.

Let $\left(\sum_{j=0}^M \cdot\right)$ denote the final equation in (17.11). We will complete the proof by showing,

$$\lim_{M\to\infty}\left|\sum_{j=0}^M \cdot\right| = \infty.$$

To do so, it suffices to show,

$$\lim_{j\to\infty}\int \exp\left(i\sum_{\frac{1}{a}g+\frac{1}{b}h=m_0} c_{(g,h)}\left(s,t\right)^{(g,h)} 2^{j\left(h\frac{e}{f}-g\right)}\right)\varsigma\left(s\right)\varsigma\left(t\right)\, ds\, dt \neq 0,$$

i.e., this limit exists and is nonzero. Note, when $(g,h)=(e,f)$, we have $h\frac{e}{f}-g=0$. Otherwise, if $c_{(g,h)}$ is nonzero and $\frac{1}{a}g+\frac{1}{b}h=m_0$, we have $h\frac{e}{f}-g<0$, by the minimality of our choice for e. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{j\to\infty}\int \exp\left(i\sum_{\frac{1}{a}g+\frac{1}{b}h=m_0} c_{(g,h)}\left(s,t\right)^{(g,h)} 2^{j\left(h\frac{e}{f}-g\right)}\right)\varsigma\left(s\right)\varsigma\left(t\right)\, ds\, dt\\
&=\int \exp\left(ic_{(e,f)}\left(s,t\right)^{(e,f)}\right)\varsigma\left(s\right)\varsigma\left(t\right)\\
&\neq 0,
\end{aligned}$$

by our choice of ς; this completes the proof. □

Remark 17.9. If we had not restricted our attention to K with small support, we could have reversed the argument (taking, instead, τ small) and shown that there exists a product kernel K such that T_K is unbounded if there is a $c_{(e,f)}\neq 0$ with (e,f) lying *above* the line passing through $(a',0)$ and $(0,b')$, where a' is the maximal a' such that $c_{(a',0)}\neq 0$, and similarly for b'.

Remark 17.10. Theorem 17.8 exemplifies the need to distinguish between pure powers and non-pure powers. In this case, the pure powers are those $\alpha\in\left\{(\tilde{a},0),\left(0,\tilde{b}\right)\right\}$ such that $c_\alpha\neq 0$, while the non-pure powers are remaining α such that $c_\alpha\neq 0$.

Remark 17.11. The reader familiar with [CWW06] will note that the necessary and sufficient conditions for the boundedness of T_K, where $K\left(s,t\right)=\frac{1}{st}$ are much more complicated than the conditions in Theorem 17.8. However, there are similarities between the results in [CWW06] and Theorem 17.8. Indeed, the assumptions on p in Theorem 17.8 can be restated as saying that the vertices of the Newton diagram of p lie on the coordinate axes.

We now turn to contrasting this with the flag kernel setting. We take all the same notation as above, but set,

$$\mathcal{A}=\left\{(\delta_1,\delta_2)\in[0,1]^2:\delta_1\leq\delta_2\right\}.$$

We will be considering operators T_K such that $K\in\mathcal{K}\left(2,e,a_0,\mathcal{A}\right)$ for some small $a_0>0$.

We take p and $0<a,b<\infty$ as above. We assume that $b\leq a$. We have,

Theorem 17.12. *In the above setting, T_K is bounded on L^2 for every $K\in\mathcal{K}\left(2,e,a_0,\mathcal{A}\right)$ (with $a_0>0$ sufficiently small) if and only if for every $c_\alpha\neq 0$, α lies on or above the line passing through $(b,0)$ and $(0,b)$.*

Proof. The if direction follows from Proposition 17.1. Indeed, one needs only verify the straightforward fact that $(\partial_x,(0,b))$ controls (∂_x,α) if and only if α lies on or above the line passing through $(0,b)$ and $(b,0)$. Recall, the definition of control depends on the set $\mathcal{A}$.

The only if follows just as in the proof of Theorem 17.8, replacing a with b throughout. It is easy to see, that when a is replaced by b, the kernels $K_{\tau,M}$ are uniformly flag kernels. □

Remark 17.13. We will see, in [SS11a], that the operators in Theorems 17.8 and 17.12 which are bounded on L^2 are also bounded on L^q $(1<q<\infty)$.

17.6 Flag kernels versus product kernels

As mentioned earlier, if we are considering operators associated to product kernels,

$$f \mapsto \psi(x) \int f(\gamma_t(x)) K(t)\ dt,$$

then Theorem 7.2 holds for a larger class γ when K is assumed to be a flag kernel (a special case of product kernels). An example can be seen by contrasting Theorems 17.8 and 17.12.

In this section, we exhibit another, simpler example of γ where our assumptions hold for flag kernels, but not product kernels. Unlike Theorems 17.8 and 17.12, we make no claim about the unboundedness of operators to which our theorem does not apply.

We consider product (and flag) kernels on $\mathbb{R}^2$ supported near the origin. We take the standard two-parameter dilations on $\mathbb{R}^2$:

$$(\delta_1, \delta_2)(s,t) = (\delta_1 s, \delta_2 t).$$

Thus, $e = ((1,0),(0,1))$. Let $\mathcal{A} = \left\{(\delta_1,\delta_2) \in [0,1]^2 : \delta_1 \leq \delta_2\right\}$. Let $X_{(1,0)} = \partial_x$, $X_{(2,0)} = e^{-\frac{1}{x^2}}\partial_y$, and $X_{(0,1)} = \partial_y$. Define,

$$\gamma_{(s,t)}(x,y) = e^{sX_{(1,0)} + s^2 X_{(2,0)} + tX_{(0,1)}}(x,y).$$

Then, for $K \in \mathcal{K}(2,e,a,\mathcal{A})$ (for $a > 0$ sufficiently small) Theorem 7.2 (see also Proposition 17.1) applies to show that operators of the form

$$f \mapsto \psi(x,y) \int f\left(\gamma_{(s,t)}(x,y)\right) K(s,t)\ ds\, dt$$

are bounded on L^2, where ψ is a cut off function supported near $0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$.

However, it is easy to see (again via Proposition 17.1) that the assumptions of Theorem 7.2 are not satisfied for the full class of product kernels: $\mathcal{K}\left(2,e,a,[0,1]^2\right)$.

Remark 17.14. The example in this section used functions that vanish to infinite order. However, we see by contrasting Theorems 17.8 and 17.12, that even when $\gamma_t(x)$ is real analytic, it could be that operator corresponding to each flag kernel is bounded on L^2, while there are operators corresponding to product kernels which are not bounded on L^2.

17.7 A multi-parameter difficulty

One of the crucial notions that we used was when a list of vector fields with formal degrees $(X_1,d_1),\ldots,(X_r,d_r)$ "generated a finite list," see Definition 5.3. In the single parameter case ($\nu = 1$, $\mathcal{A} = [0,1]$), we saw in Lemma 3.2 that this notion is essentially equivalent to the set $\{X_1,\ldots,X_r\}$ generating an involutive distribution which is locally finitely generated as a C^∞ module. The point of this section is to exhibit an example showing that the obvious multi-parameter generalization of the above does not hold.

More specifically, let $\nu = 2$ and $\mathcal{A} = [0,1]^2$. Suppose we are given two lists of vector fields with two-parameter formal degrees, $(X_1,d_1),\ldots,(X_r,d_r)$, $(Y_1,d_1'),\ldots,(Y_{r'},d_{r'}')$. We assume that $d_1,\ldots,d_r$ are all 0 in the second component, while $d_1',\ldots,d_{r'}'$ are all 0 in the first component. Suppose we wish to show that,

$$(X_1,d_1),\ldots,(X_r,d_r),(Y_1,d_1'),\ldots,(Y_{r'},d_{r'}') \tag{17.12}$$

generates a finite list. In analogy with the single-parameter case, one might hope that the following (necessary) condition would be sufficient to prove that (17.12) generates a finite list:

- The involutive distribution generated by $\{X_1,\ldots,X_r\}$ is locally finitely generated as a C^∞ module.
- The involutive distribution generated by $\{Y_1,\ldots,Y_{r'}\}$ is locally finitely generated as a C^∞ module.
- The involutive distribution generated by $\{X_1,\ldots,X_r,Y_1,\ldots,Y_{r'}\}$ is locally finitely generated as a C^∞ module.

This is not the case.

We exhibit an example where the above hold, but which does not generate a finite list. Our vector fields are,

$$\left(\partial_x, (1,0)\right), \left(e^{-\frac{1}{x^2}}\partial_y, (0,1)\right), \left(\partial_y, (0,2)\right).$$

Let $g(x) = e^{-\frac{1}{x^2}}$, and let $g^{(m)}$ denote the m-th derivative of g. If the above vector fields generated a finite list on a neighborhood of 0, then, in particular there would exist an m such that for every $1 \geq \delta > 0$,

$$\delta g^{(m)}(x) = \sum_{j<m} \delta c_j^\delta (x) g^{(j)}(x) + \delta^2 c^\delta (x), \tag{17.13}$$

where c_j^δ and c^δ are bounded uniformly in $\delta > 0$ and $x > 0$. To see this we have taken the special case $(1,\delta) \in [0,1]^2$. (17.13) is clearly impossible.

Remark 17.15. Once again, we have used functions which vanish to infinite order at a point. This is essential, in the sense that the above phenomenon does not occur in the real analytic category. We will see this fact in [SS11b].

17.8 An example on the Heisenberg group

In this section, we discuss in more detail the example given at the end of Section 16. The operators considered in this section are less singular than those in Section 17.2. We work on the three dimensional Heisenberg group[52] $\mathbb{H}^1$. As a manifold $\mathbb{H}^1$ is diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^3$. We write (x, y, t) for coordinates of $\mathbb{H}^1$. The group law on $\mathbb{H}^1$ is given by (16.8) and we define two parameter dilations on $\mathbb{H}^1$ by (16.9). The Lie algebra of $\mathbb{H}^1$ is three dimensional, and one may take as a basis, $X = \partial_x + 2y\partial_t$, $Y = \partial_y - 2x\partial_t$, $T = \partial_t$.

Given a bounded subset $\{\varsigma_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}^2} \subset C_0^\infty\left(B^3(1)\right)$ satisfying,

$$\int \varsigma_j (x,y,t)\; dx\, dt = 0, \quad \int \varsigma_j(x,y,t)\; dy\, dt, \forall j,$$

we define a distribution by,

$$K(x,y,t) = \sum_{(j_1,j_2)\in\mathbb{Z}^2} 2^{2j_1+2j_2} \varsigma_j \left(2^{j_1}x, 2^{j_2}y, 2^{j_1+j_2}t\right) = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}^2} \varsigma_j^{\left(2^j\right)}(x,y,t).$$

Theorem 17.16. *The operator given by,*

$$f \mapsto f * K$$

is bounded $L^2\left(\mathbb{H}^1\right) \to L^2\left(\mathbb{H}^1\right)$.

It is not hard to see that the operator in Theorem 17.16 is essentially of the form covered by Theorem 7.2. The differences are: we have not restricted to K with small support, and we have not localized the operator. However, using the dilation invariance of the class of operators in Theorem 17.16, it is easy to see that Theorem 17.16 follows from the result for K with small support and T localized. Alternatively, our entire proof goes through, essentially unchanged for the operators in Theorem 17.16: one does not need to use the small support of K or the localizing functions in this case. We leave the details to the reader.

At this point we wish to discuss the proof of Theorem 7.2 in the context of Theorem 17.16. Indeed, define the operator,

$$T_j f = f * \varsigma_j^{\left(2^j\right)}, \quad j \in \mathbb{Z}^2.$$

It is not hard to see that $T_j^* T_j$ is essentially of the same form as T_j. Thus, at first glance, one might think that a T^*T iteration type argument would not be useful in proving Theorem 17.16. On the contrary, however, a T^*T iteration argument was essential to our proof. The idea is that when $j,k \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ and $j_1 > k_1$ and $j_2 < k_2$, the operator $\left(T_j^* T_k\right)^* T_j^* T_k$ has a less singular Schwartz kernel than $T_j^* T_k$. This is the essence of our proof.

---

[52] The methods discussed here generalize to any stratified nilpotent Lie group.

We close this section with one final remark. If the convolution in Theorem 17.16 is replaced by the Euclidean convolution on $\mathbb{R}^3$, then the operator may be unbounded on L^2.[53] This further accents the need to distinguish between pure powers and non-pure powers. The point is, because of the dilations (16.9), x and y are pure powers, while t is a non-pure power. In the Heisenberg group case, the vector fields corresponding to the pure powers are $(X,(1,0))$, $(Y,(0,1))$. The vector field corresponding to the non-pure power is $(T,(1,1)) = \left(\frac{1}{4}[X,Y], (1,0)+(0,1)\right)$ and therefore is controlled by the commutator of X and Y. In the Euclidean case, the vector fields corresponding to the pure powers are $(\partial_x,(1,0))$ and $(\partial_y,(0,1))$; while the vector field corresponding to the non-pure power is $(\partial_t,(1,1))$ which is not controlled by the previous two.

Finally, to see the operator might not be bounded on L^2 if the usual Euclidean convolution is used, we need only show that there is a K as above whose Fourier transform is unbounded. To see this, let $\phi \in C_0^\infty((-1,1))$ be such that $\widehat{\phi}(0) = 1$. Let $\psi \in C_0^\infty((-1,1))$ be such that $\int \psi = 0$, $\widehat{\psi}(1) > 0$. Define,

$$\varsigma_{j_1,j_2}(x,y,t) = \begin{cases} \phi(x)\,\phi(y)\,\psi(t) & \text{if } j_1 = -j_2, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It is easy to see that these ς_j satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem 17.16. We have,

$$\widehat{K}(0,0,1) = \sum_{\substack{(j_1,j_2)\in\mathbb{Z}^2 \\ j_1=-j_2}} \widehat{\psi}(1) = \infty,$$

completing the proof.

References

[Bou89] J. Bourgain, *A remark on the maximal function associated to an analytic vector field*, Analysis at Urbana, Vol. I (Urbana, IL, 1986–1987), London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., vol. 137, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1989, pp. 111–132. MR MR1009171 (90h:42028)

[Chr92] Michael Christ, *The strong maximal function on a nilpotent group*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **331** (1992), no. 1, 1–13. MR MR1104197 (92j:42018)

[CNSW99] Michael Christ, Alexander Nagel, Elias M. Stein, and Stephen Wainger, *Singular and maximal Radon transforms: analysis and geometry*, Ann. of Math. (2) **150** (1999), no. 2, 489–577. MR MR1726701 (2000j:42023)

[CWW06] Anthony Carbery, Stephen Wainger, and James Wright, *Singular integrals and the Newton diagram*, Collect. Math. (2006), no. Vol. Extra, 171–194. MR MR2264209 (2008c:42011)

[Die60] J. Dieudonné, *Foundations of modern analysis*, Pure and Applied Mathematics, Vol. X, Academic Press, New York, 1960. MR MR0120319 (22 #11074)

[FP97] R. Fefferman and J. Pipher, *Multiparameter operators and sharp weighted inequalities*, Amer. J. Math. **119** (1997), no. 2, 337–369. MR 1439553 (98b:42027)

[Gal79] André Galligo, *Théorème de division et stabilité en géométrie analytique locale*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **29** (1979), no. 2, vii, 107–184. MR MR539695 (81e:32009)

[Lob70] Claude Lobry, *Contrôlabilité des systèmes non linéaires*, SIAM J. Control **8** (1970), 573–605. MR MR0271979 (42 #6860)

---

[53] The closely related fact that the double Hilbert transform on the surface $z = xy$ in $\mathbb{R}^3$ is not bounded on L^2 was noted by Ricci and Stein [RS92].

[NRS01] Alexander Nagel, Fulvio Ricci, and Elias M. Stein, *Singular integrals with flag kernels and analysis on quadratic CR manifolds*, J. Funct. Anal. **181** (2001), no. 1, 29–118. MR MR1818111 (2001m:22018)

[NRSW11] Alexander Nagel, Fulvio Ricci, Elias M. Stein, and Stephen Wainger, *Singular integrals with flag kernels on homogeneous groups: I*, 2011, to appear in Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana.

[NSW85] Alexander Nagel, Elias M. Stein, and Stephen Wainger, *Balls and metrics defined by vector fields. I. Basic properties*, Acta Math. **155** (1985), no. 1-2, 103–147. MR MR793239 (86k:46049)

[NW77] Alexander Nagel and Stephen Wainger, *L^2 boundedness of Hilbert transforms along surfaces and convolution operators homogeneous with respect to a multiple parameter group*, Amer. J. Math. **99** (1977), no. 4, 761–785. MR MR0450901 (56 #9192)

[RS76] Linda Preiss Rothschild and E. M. Stein, *Hypoelliptic differential operators and nilpotent groups*, Acta Math. **137** (1976), no. 3-4, 247–320. MR MR0436223 (55 #9171)

[RS92] F. Ricci and E. M. Stein, *Multiparameter singular integrals and maximal functions*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **42** (1992), no. 3, 637–670. MR 1182643 (94d:42020)

[SS11a] Elias M. Stein and Brian Street, *Multi-parameter singular Radon transforms II: the L^p theory*, 2011, in preparation.

[SS11b] ———, *Multi-parameter singular Radon transforms III: real analytic surfaces*, 2011, in preparation.

[Str11] Brian Street, *Multi-parameter Carnot-Carathéodory balls and the theorem of Frobenius*, 2011, to appear in Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana.

[TW03] Terence Tao and James Wright, *L^p improving bounds for averages along curves*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **16** (2003), no. 3, 605–638 (electronic). MR MR1969206 (2004j:42005)

University of Wisconsin-Madison, Department of Mathematics, 480 Lincoln Dr., Madison, WI, 53706

street@math.wisc.edu

MCS2010: Primary 42B20, Secondary 42B25

Keywords: Calderón-Zygmund theory, singular integrals, singular radon transforms, product kernels, flag kernels.